Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Collection of Puritan Literature.

Division

Section

Number

11153 SCB

THE Scripture Gospel defended, AND *Christ, Grace and Free Justification Vindicated* Against the Libertines,

Who use the names of CHRIST, FREE GRACE and JUSTIFICATION, to subvert the Gospel, and Christianity, and that Christ, Grace and Justification, which they in zealous Ignorance think they plead for, to the injury of Christ, the danger of Souls, and the scandalizing of the weak, the insulting of Adversaries, and the Dividing of the Churches.

Yet charitably differencing the wordy Errours of unskilful Opiniaters, from their Practical Piety: And the mistaken Notions of some Excellent Divines, from the gross Libertine Antinomian Errours.

In Two Books.

The first, A Breviate of Fifty Controversies about Justification; written about thirteen years past, and cast by till now, after many provocations, by Press, Pulpit and Backbiting.

The second upon the sudden reviving of Antinomianism, which seemed almost extinct near Thirty four years: And the re-printing of Dr. *Crisp*'s Sermons with Additions; with twelve Reverend Names prefixed for a decoy, when some of them abhor the Errour of the Book, and know not what was in it, but yielded by surprize only to declare that they believed him that told them that the Additions were a true Copy.

By *RICHARD BAXTER*, an Offender of the Offenders of the Church, by Defending the Truth and Duty which they fight against.

Lux oculos vexat, ubi noctua luminis ofor,
Putrida suspecti vexabunt ulcera tactus.

LONDON,
Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst*, at the *Bible* and *Three Crowns*, at the lower end of *Cheapside*. 1690.

HEB. 11. 5, 6. *Without Faith it is impossible to please God: He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is the Rewarder of them that diligently seek him.*

Luke 19. 17. *Well, thou good Servant: Because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou Authority over ten Cities.* So Mat. 25. 21.

Mat. 25. 34, 40, 46. *Inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the Foundation of the World: For I was hungry and ye gave me Meat —— In as much as ye have done it to one of the least of these my Brethren, ye have done it to me —— And these shall go into Everlasting Punishment, and the Righteous into Life Eternal.*

Gen. 22. 16, 17, 18. *By my self have I sworn, saith the Lord, because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy Son ——* &c.

John 16. 27. *The Father himself loveth you, because you have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God.*

1 John 3. 12, 13. *Whatsoever we ask we receive of him, because we keep his Commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight, and this is his Commandment that we believe on the Name of his Son Jesus Christ and Love one another.*

Rev. 3. 4. *They shall walk with me in white, for they are worthy.*

Rev. 3. 10. *Because thou hast kept the Word of my Patience, I will keep thee,* &c.

Mar. 7. 29. *For this saying go thy way, the Devil is gone out,* &c.

Mat. 5. 20. *Except your Righteousness exceed the Righteousness of the* Scribes, *and* Pharisees, *you shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Mat. 12. 36, 37. *Every idle Word that Men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of Judgment. For by thy Words thou shalt be Justified, and by thy Words thou shalt be Condemned.*

Jam. 2. 24. *You see then that by Works a man is Justified, and not by Faith only. So* v. 13. *to the end.*

Rom. 8. 29, 30. *Whom he foreknew, them he predestinated to be conformed to the Image of his Son, that he might be the first born among many Brethren: And whom he did predestinate, them he also called: And whom he called them he also justified, and whom he justified them he also glorified.*

Luke 18. 13, 14. *I tell you, This man went down —— Justified rather than the other.*

Prov. 17. 15. *He that Justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the Just, even they both are abomination to the Lord.*

Of Faith imputed to Righteousness, and our being Justified by Faith, See Rom. 3. 30, 26. Rom. 4. 11, 22, 23, 24. *He that considereth the different sence of* δικαίωμα, δικαίωσις *and* δικαιοσύνη, (*the first usually signifying the Practical or Preceptive* matter *that is* Righteousness, *the second* Active efficient Justification, *and the third the* State *of the* Just, Qualitative *or Relative, or* ipsam Justitiam, *will the better expound the Word Justification as it is in our Translations.*

Rom.

Rom. 4. 24, 25. *For us also to whom it* shall be imputed (not is before we believe,) if (a Conditional) *we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead: Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our Justification*: (Not only obeyed and suffered for our Justification, *but was* raised for it.) διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν, *efficiently to make us just relatively and qualitatively, and so to justify us, and consequently to judge us just.*

Exodus 23. 7. *I will not justify the wicked.* Obj. Rom. 4. 5. *He justifieth the ungodly,* Answ. *Yes: By making him Just by Pardon, Adoption and Godliness: As he healeth the sick, and raiseth the dead,* in sensu diviso.

Acts 2. 38. *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of sins,* 13. 38. *By him all that believe are Justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the Law of* Moses, *See* Titus 3. 6, 7. 1 Cor. 6. 8, 9, 10, 11. Rom. 2. 13, 14. 1 Peter 1. 16, 17. 2 Cor. 9. 6.

Rev. 20. 12, 13. *And the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the Books according to their works,* &c. (Which is oft said in Scripture.)

John 5. 22. 29. *The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son, and hath given him authority to Execute Judgment.* —— *They that have* Done Good *to the Resurrection of Life, and they that have done evil to the Resurrection of damnation.*

2 Tim. 4. 7, 8. *I have fought a good fight.* —— *Henceforth there is laid up for me a Crown of Righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me at that day, and not to me only, but to all that love his appearing.*

See Heb. 6. 10. 1 Cor. 15. 58. Col. 3. 24. Heb. 11. 26. 2. Thef. 1. 5, 6, 7. Mat. 5. 12.

Mat. 6. 2. 4. 6. & 5. 12. & 10. 41. 42. & 19. 29. 1 Cor. 9. 17. Rom. 2. 5. 10. Mat. 7. 4.

1 Joh. 1. 9. *If we confefs our fins, he is faithful and juft to forgive us our fins, and to cleanfe us from all unrighteoufnefs. So* Rom. 10. 10. 13.

Mat. 6. 14, 15. *If ye forgive men their treſpaſſes, your heavenly Father will forgive you: But if ye forgive not men. --- Neither will.*

1 Joh. 3. 17. *Let no man deceive you: He that doth Righteoufnefs is Righteous.*

Iſa. 1. 16, 17, 18. *Ceafe to do evil* &c. *Come now If your fins be red as crimfon.*

Iſa. 55. 6, 7. *Seek the Lord while he may be found,* &c. *Let the wicked forſake his way,* &c. *Let him return to the Lord and he will have mercy on him,* &c.

Acts 10. 35. *In every nation he that feareth God and worketh Righteoufnefs is accepted of him.*

Rev. 22. 14. *Bleſſed are they that do his Commandments, that they may have right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in by the Gate into the City.*

John 3. 18. *He that believeth not is condemned already, becauſe,* &c.

Rom. 8. 9. *If any man have not the Spirit of Chriſt, the ſame is none of his. See alſo,* verſe 4. 5. 7. 14.

2 Cor. 13. 5. *Jeſus Chriſt is in you except ye be reprobates.*

Col. 1. 27. *Chriſt in you the hope of glory.*

See Eph. 2. *What the Elect are before Converſion.*

1 Cor. 6. 9, 10, 11. *Know ye not that the unrighteous*

righteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God? Be not deceived, neither fornicators —— And such were some of you: But ye are washed, ye are Sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.

1 Thes. 6. 10. *God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of Love.*

Phil. 2. 13. *Work out your Salvation with fear and trembling: For it is God that worketh,* &c.

Rev. 2, & 3. *Read the promises to him that overcometh.*

Mat. 6. 19, 20. *Lay up for your selves a treasure in heaven.*

Luke 16. 9. *Make you friends of the Mammon of unrighteousness, that when you fail they may receive you into the everlasting habitations.*

Gen. 4. 7. *If thou dost well shalt thou not be accepted? But if thou,* &c.

Luke 13. 3. 5. *Except ye repent ye shall all perish.*

Mat. 18. 3. *Except ye be converted and become as little Children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Heb. 5. 9. *He is become the Author of Eternal Salvation to all them that obey him.*

Luke 19. 27. *These mine Enemies that would not I should reign over them.*

Heb. 10. 33. *Cast not away your confidence which hath great recompense of reward,* 39. *We are not of them that draw back to perdition, but of them that believe to the saving of the Soul.*

Mat. 18. 32, 35. *O thou wicked Servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because,* &c. *so shall my heavenly Father do also to you if you from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.*

The

The Answer to all this by the Adversaries.

I. By the *Infidels*, [*The Scripture is not the Word of God.*]

II. By the *Mahometans* in special: [*The followers of Christ altered it.*]

III. By *Papists*, *Scripture is to us but what the Church declareth of it*; 1. *The reading of it, and rejecting supplemental Tradition by the Vulgar, causeth heresies.*

IV. By the *Quaker*, *It is the light within us that is our Rule.*

V. The *Enthusiasts*, or *Fanaticks*, We must try Scripture by the Spirit, and not the Spirit by the Scripture: (the Apostles Spirit by ours, and not our low measure by theirs.)

VI. The seekers. The Scripture must first be recovered by a true Ministry.

VII. The Cabbalist and Familist; *It is not to be understood Literally, but Mystically.*

VIII. The *Antinomian Libertine*: *The written word, or at least all that prescribeth duty and hath conditional promises, is but a Covenant of works. The Covenant of Grace is only the Spirits Effectual work*: *I will, and you shall.*

A Breviate of the Doctrine of

Justification,

Dilivered in many Books,

By *RICHARD BAXTER*:

In many Propositions,

And the Solution of 50 Controversies about it.

Written,

1. To end such Controversies.
2. To confute Rash Censurers and Errours.
3. To inform the Ignorant.
4. To procure Correction from wiser men, if I mistake.

Occasioned by some mens Accusation of me to others, that will not vouchsafe their Instruction to my self.

And by the Erroneous and dangerous Writings and Preachings of some well-meaning men, such as Mr. *Troughton*, *&c.* who at once mistake and misreport God's Word and ours, and fight in the dark against Christian Faith and Love.

LONDON,

Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst*, at the *Bible* and *Three Crowns*, at the lower end of *Cheapside*. 1690.

The Preface long ago written.

Reader,

IT was the *Army and Sectarian Antinomians (more fitly called Libertines) who first called me in the year* 1645. *and* 1646. *to study better than I had done the Doctrine of the Covenants and Laws of God, of Redemption and Justification: I fetcht my first resolving thoughts from no Book but the Bible, specially* Mat. 5, *and* 6, *and* 25. Grotius de Satisfactione *next gave me more light. While I was considering many mens friendly Animadversions on my Aphorisms, and answering some (that more differed from each other than from me) it increased light, especially the Animadversions of Mr.* George Lawson: *My Writings against the Antinomians had success beyond my expectations, though some good men of the Party called Independent, having more heat than light, deceived by the notions of some that had spoken injudiciously before them, cast out suspicions and contradictions in a jealousie that I encroached on the honour of* Free Grace: *I mean such men as prefaced the Book called* The Marrow of Modern Divinity, *which on pretence of* Moderation *is Antinomian or Libertine, and very injudicious and unsound: And others Books (such as* Paul Hobsons, *Mr.* Saltmarshes, Bunyan *on the Covenants,* &c.) *which ignorantly subverted the Gospel of Christ, came out on the same business, and revealed mens mistakes on pretence of revealing the Mystery of* Free Grace.

John Goodwin *was then, and before, publishing his Judgment of Justification, and Mr.* Walker, *and Mr.* Roborough *wrote against him, with great disparity of light and strength. But because* J. G. *turned to the Arminians, prejudice cryed down his Doctrine of*

Justification, (and it was not all to be approved.) Mr. Gataker *published many things to the like purpose, and among the rest, the Narrative of Mr.* Wottons *Case, referred to many* London *Divines, and decided by them; Of my suspension of my Aphorisms, and of my Contests with Mr* Craudon, *Mr.* Eyres, *Mr.* Warner, *and afterwards with Dr.* Tully, *I need not here make particular mention. The most that I converst with seemed of my Judgment: The rest (beside the Animadverters on my Aphorisms) who freelier spake of me behind my back, would none of them speak to me.* Vavasor Powel, *and Mr.* Ed. Bagshaw, *were two of the chief. Many worthy men published the same Doctrine which I asserted; especially Mr.* Gibbons *of* Blackfryars *(in his Sermon in the Morning Lectures at St.* Giles) *Mr.* Benjamin Woodbridge, *Mr.* Hotchkis, *Mr.* Thomas Warren, *Mr.* Graile, *and Mr.* Jessop, *laboured to prove that Dr.* Twisse *meant the same, who seems to speak for Eternal Immanent Justification: And Mr.* Truman, *and* Lud. Le Blankes *Theses at last came out (after the* Theses Salmurienses, *and the* Breme *Divines,* Lud. Crocius Conrad. Bergius, *and the* Berlin, Johan. Bergius) *as clear as any.*

But the practice of some (who wanted the humility and diligence which were necessary to learn the Truths which they knew not) was just the same with that of the Prelates in Councils for a thousand years, even to put it to the Vote of men of their own mind, or to lean on the names of some of their Predecessors who were men of note, and especially to cry down those that heard them not.

And lately came out a Book of one Mr. Troughtons *of the same temper with the rest. He allarmeth the Nation, as if the Enemy were at the Gates. He is a man that hath been blind from his Infancy or early Childhood, and I suppose never read a Book, but hath had*

some

some one to read to him, and he undertaketh to tell the sense of Protestant Writers, and Fathers, and the words and sense of Mr. Hotchkis *and me, and such others, whom he fiercely assaulteth as his and the Churches Adversaries: And the good man heapeth up untruths in matter of fact in false reciting his Adversaries words and sense. Besides his Libertine false Doctrine, (as that the Covenant or Promise of Justification hath no Conditions, no not Faith, and such like,) and abuseth the Authors whom he citeth. I thought once to have bestowed two or three days work in answering him, but I desisted, partly because he was one of those that had written at the rate of some former Adversaries, who had so formed their Assaults, that they had left me little to answer but a* Mentiris, *which is so unpleasing a task, that they that most deserve it cannot bear it. And it hath been my lot since* 1662. *in which the powerful Ringleader* Morley *began, to have so many such Books written against me, and such reports divulged of me, as if the Devil had been studying to prove,* Rom 3. 4. that every man is a Lyar, *to be true in a sense beyond the meaning, and to bring all History at least of Disputers into discredit, and to make it become a valid consequence* [It is said and written by a domineering, or an ambitious, or an erroneous, or angry Adversary; *Ergo* it is false.] *And also I was loth to say that against the man that his Book required: For I hear he is a very honest man, and not only blind; but a sufferer for Nonconformity with the rest; and when he was a Child, his Grand-father, Grand-mother, and other kindred in* Coventry *were my hearers and loving friends, and godly people: His Father and Mother my very near Neighbours, and weekly, and almost daily company, have asked my Counsel, what they should do with a blind Boy that was much inclined to Learning, and I encouraged them to further him, not foreseeing his*

snares. 3. *And I perceive that judicious Readers have no need of an Antidote against so weak a Poison. He that gave me the Animadversions answered in the end, told me, He had* scarce patience to read him. *And as to those that are so weak as to need an answer to such a Book, it's like they are too weak to understand one; or will think him in the right that hath the last word, and that may be he that liveth longest. The great fault of the good man is that which is too predominant in all Cases in corrupted Nature, even an* unhumbled understanding, *which doth not sufficiently suspect it self, much less is acquainted with its own Ignorance, but when it most mistaketh, doth most confidently rage. Who would think that such a man could be ignorant how unfit he was who never saw their Books, to undertake such account as he giveth of Fathers, Protestant Writers, or us his chosen Adversaries? When his Reader hath read to him some parcels of our Writings, how knoweth he what he omitteth, or what explications he never read? And how uncapable must his memory needs be of retaining and laying all together out of so many Volumes, and making a charge, and passing a Judgment thereupon, unless his memory be greater far than Bishop* Hall *saith Dr.* John Reynolds *reading and memory was* [next to a Miracle,] *which his gross falsifications shew that it is not.*

And 4. *I found so many ready to write on the same Subject for my sense, that I the more thought it needless to my self. Sir* Charles Wolsley *hath lately done it very judiciously. I have lately perused divers Manuscripts that are such prepared for the Press: One of Mr.* William Mannings, *another of Mr.* Clerke *Son to Mr.* Samuel Clerke (*and Dr.* Twisse *hath a Latine Disputation to the same sense,*) *and some more* (*all Nonconformists.*)

But yet I still hear some London *Brethren use to*

cast

cast out their suspicions, aspersions and censures behind my back, and some in their Conferences when they meet: Whereupon I drew up this Paper of Explicatory Propositions and Controversies, only to let them truly know my sense, and long after gave it that honest Dr. Annesley, *at whose house sometimes some meet of different Judgments in such things, desiring him but to get it read to them, and to procure me their Animadversions on what they did any of them dislike; instead of their unprofitable Obloquy when I cannot hear them; for this I should take for a great brotherly kindness: But it is now near a twelve month that I have waited in hope of it, but cannot procure a word to this day; which maketh me think it needful to publish that which I intended but for their private view. Yet one that to me professed dissent, seemed to take it well that I intreated his Reasons, and promised to give them me, but never did. Nor hath any one yet answered,* 1. *My Confession*; 2. *My Disputations of Justification*; 3. *My Apology (to many;)* 4. *My small Tract of* Saving Faith *to Bishop* Barlow; 5. *My Treatise of* Justifying Righteousness *to Dr.* Tully.

This week an honest judicious moderate Friend (that is more a Conscenter than a Dissenter, as far as I can judge, sent me the Notes which I answer in the latter end, as partly his own, and partly others; which (not as opposing them, but as tending to elucidate the whole Cause) I here adjoyn, though all or most here said, is said elsewhere before, which I mention, lest you think that I took all for his own Opinion which he cited out of Dr. Owen, *who himself reformed much of his former Judgment about Doctrine and Government before he died. The Lord heal his Church by* Light, Love *and* Humility, *which is torn by* Ignorance, Uncharitableness *and* Pride. *Amen.*

The Prologue.

§. 1. THE Doctrine of the Justification of sinful man, by Christ as our Redeemer, Saviour and Judge, is of so great moment, that it should be Skilfully taught to all that are Catechised. And yet by the Unskilfulness of Teachers, is become a foot-ball of Strife and Contention, and of Wrathful Censures, and Reproach, among those who are most zealous for the safe and honourable preservation of it, and really differ more in the Terms and Methods which they think must preserve it, than in the inward practical sense of the matter itself.

§. 2. Two things constitute this itch or leprosy rather of strife, which experience maketh us fear is uncurable: And these two are one. *Ignorance*: Ignorance of the case: And Ignorance of our Ignorance. But what Ignorance is it? I am grieved to know and speak it. It is Ignorance of *words* or the art of speaking; of Grammar and Logick. O what a plague did *Nimrod* bring on the World, and what a *Babel* hath it been by the confusion of language to this day! How vain hath peaceable Dr. *Wilkins* attempt of an Universal Character proved? My good old highly valued Friend, Mr. *John Eliots* long ago wrote to me, that to make the *Hebrew* the Universal Language, and to set up a Godly Magistracy in the world were the two things yet to be done for Universal Concord and Reformation: Alas, good man? *Abi in cel-*

lam,

lam, &c. If you can get the Earth to drink up the flood of Perſecution caſt out againſt you in *New-England*, it is well. Little did I think when I was a Schoolboy Learning my Grammar, that I ſhould live to find that the Chriſtian World is all in confuſion, Diviſion, Wrath, Schiſm, War, and Blood, and much, if not moſtly for want of Skill in words or Grammar!

But indeed were there one Univerſal Language it would not be enough to heal us. For we are moſtly ſo dull of nature, & ſo ſlothful in our Studies, and ſo apt to ſpeak as our parents or firſt Maſters or Company teach us, that we are utterly diſagreed and unreconcileable about the ſenſe of our ommon words in our Mother Tongue. So that if *Engliſh* were the only Language of the World, we ſhould ſtill be diſagreed: I have been a great comtemner of vain oſtentation in Critical or Verbal Skill: But I ſee that rightly uſed about things neceſſary, it muſt be a principal help to end moſt of our Controverſies.

§. 3. Though ſupernatural Revelation far exceedeth the meer light of Nature, and the teachings of the Creation, yet the difficulty of learning and ſpeaking *many* Languages, without which we cannot Preach abroad in the World, and the Univerſal Wars about words that take up and corrupt mankind, do make me read the 19 *Pſalm.* with great regard, and not think ſo hardly as I have been tempted to do, of Gods dealing with the heathen and generality of mankind, while the Heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament ſheweth his handy works, while day unto day utters Knowledge and while Sun Moon, and Stars, do Preach God with ſo loud a voice, and their ſound goeth through all the World and there is no Nation or Tongue

Harp and Trumpet, or else who can know what is Piped or Harped, or can prepare himself to the Battle? So we unless we utter words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? But we speak into the air, v. 9. But confusion and ambiguity are not instructive, but deceitful to the simple.

2. So they talk much of *Imputation*, and neither know nor tell you what *Imputation* is: But take it mostly to be that which even Dr. *Crisp* calleth a charging God with falshood; as if it were his Reputing, Reckoning, Esteeming or Supposing us to be what indeed we are not, or to have done or suffered what we did not, or to have what we have not: Whereas *Paul* meaneth nothing (& λογίζεται signifieth nothing) but a true accounting us to be what we are, and to have done what we did, and to have what we indeed have. And to impute righteousness to us, signifieth but truly to Repute, Account or Judge us Righteous. Those that are here most inclined to mistake, should the rather take Mr. *Bradshaw* to be impartial, because he was for Independent Church Government (tho sharp against Separation.) And in the Preface to his English Edition of his little Book of Justification, he hath in a few lines said enough to end all this Controversy, by a true explaining in what sense Christs Righteousness is imputed to us, and how not.

3. And do they tell us with any agreement what Righteousness of Christ they call Imputed? Some say only the Passive, some also the Active; Some also the habitual, and some also the Divine. Much less agree they to what Effects it is imputed, and how far.

4. Also the name of Faith is used without a due and true explication of their meaning. One by

Faith

Faith meaneth not *Faith*, but Christs Righteousness. Another calls it an Instrument, and yet denieth it to be the τὸ *credere* that is, the Act of Faith indeed, as if any thing else was that instrument. Another saith it is but one Physical act, and not like contracting, a Moral complication of many Physical Acts: One saith it is but one Act, and all other Acts of Faith he that looketh to be Justified by denieth the Doctrine of Grace or true Justification, and so leave men to despair because they can never tell which that single is, and how to escape the damning Doctrine of Justification by works. One saith it is the Understandings assent: Another that it is the Wills recumbency, or trust: One saith it is only Faith in Christ that Justifieth, and not in God the Father or the Holy Ghost: One saith it is only Faith in Christs Priestly Office, and not in Christ as Prophet or King; some say it is not Faith in his whole Priestly Office, either his Intercession or Heavenly Priesthood, but only in his Sacrifice and Obedience. Another that it is only the trusting on his Imputed Righteousness: Another that it is none of all these, but only the belief that we are already Justified by Christ. One saith we are Justified only at once by the first numerical Act of Faith, and never by any after Act: Another that an Act of the same Species continueth our Justification. And this confusion is from the vain fantasy of men, that will divide and mince and yet will not sufficiently distinguish: and know not that by Faith is meant our becoming Christians and continuing such.

5. So they talk loud against *Works* in the Case of Justification, and know not what either *Paul* or *James* or Christ meaneth by *works*. But they dream that *Works* and *Acts* are of the same signification; As

As if every humane Act were that which *Paul* meaneth by *works*, contrary to his expreſs explication: And ſo to be Juſtified by Faith muſt be to be Juſtified by Works. One ſaith, we will grant Juſtification by Faith, if you take it aright, to be a going wholly out of our ſelves and denying all our own righteouſneſs, and going to Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs alone. But is their choſen Metaphor [of *Going out*, and *Going to*] an *Act* or no *Act*? If an Act, than it is *works*, if they may be believed. If *no Act*, then their meaning is, *we confeſs that you* are *Juſtified* by *Believing*, if *you do not believe*: *You are Juſtified by Faith, if Faith be nothing*; *and by coming to Chriſt* if *you come not to him*, or *it be nothing*. Such is the ſence of theſe Confounders and Corrupters.

But theſe and many ſuch miſtakes are to be opened in their proper place.

That which I here intend is (not a confutation of this or that writer, but) to give them a breviate of my own Judgment, who will not read what I have largely written in many books long ago, pretending that the length of the books is their reaſon; and yet have not ſo much conſcience as to ſuſpend their cenſures, no nor their back-biting, falſe accuſations of that which they have not leiſure to underſtand or read; They judge hard caſes which they never digeſted by any anſwerable Study; and Scruple not Judging and Slandering perſons unheard.

Corrupting the Goſpel, and ſo excellent a Subject as the Doctrine of Grace, and of the Office and Merits and Judgment of Chriſt, and ſo of Chriſtianity it ſelf, is a matter that conſcience ſhould more tenderly fear, than wearing a Surplice, or kneeling at the Sacrament, or communicating with a Church that uſeth the Common-Prayers. To think thoſe unworthy

unworthy of their Communion that use such Ceremonies or forms of prayer, and at the same time to prophane so high a part of the name of God, as is his Grace in Christ, and his Justifying, Governing and Saving works, and this (*quoad verba*) by corrupting it even in Essentials, and then to defame as erroneous those that are not as Ignorant and Erroneous as themselves, and to foment malice and errour and Sects by such lying defamations: This is a Nonconformity which I earnestly desire that no man that loveth Christ, or Free grace, or the Church or his own Soul, may ever take for his duty or his honour, or rashly as a sequacious admirer of any mistaken leader be ever guilty of: What is straining at a Gnat and swallowing a Camel, if this be not? And of how ill a constitution is such a blind and partial conscience?

I shall here study brevity, and first explain the Doctrine of Grace, and Righteousness and Justification, in some self-evident Propositions. And next briefly resolve about fifty doubts or Controversies hereabout.

The

THE CONTENTS.

1. *THe nature of Justification explained.*
Controv. I. *Whether it be an Immanent Act in God, and from Eternity.*

Cont. II. *Whether the Covenant of Grace be made only with Christ; or with us also.*

Cont. III *Whether the Covenant of Grace have any condition required of us.*

Cont. IV. *Whether our performance of the Condition efficiently justify us.*

Cont. V. *Whether we are justified by Christs righteousness imputed to us: And whether the Scripture say we are.*

Cont. VI. *In what sense is Christs Righteousness imputed to us.*

Cont. VII. *What Righteousness of Christ is it that is ours and imputed to us; the Passive, the Active, the Habitual, or the Divine, or all.*

Cont. VIII. *Whether Christs Righteousness be the Efficient, Material, or Formal cause of our Righteousness, or Justification?*

Cont. IX. *Whether the Union between Christ and*

and believers be not so near as maketh them the same Subject, and so the Accident of Christs righteousnes, to be ours in itself.

Cont. 10. *Are we not so righteous by an Union with Christ as we are sinners by our Union with* Adam.

Cont. XI. *Is not Christs Righteousnes ours, as our sins were his by imputation?*

Cont. 12. *Doth Christs Righteousnes cause our Sanctification, in the same sort of Causality as it causeth our Justification?*

Cont. XIII. *Is it faith itself that is said to be imputed to us for Righteousnes, or only Christ, or Christs Righteousnes.*

Cont. XIV. *Whether Grace be Grace and free if it have any condition.*

Cont. XV. *Whether Repentance be any condition of Pardon and Justification, and to affirm it, do not equal it with Faith,*

Cont. XVI. *Whether faith justify us as a meritorious cause or as a dispositive cause of receiving Justification, or as a meer condition, or an Instrumental cause.*

Cont. XVII. *Is Justifying faith an act of the understanding or of the Will?*

Cont. XVIII. *Of the distinction of* fides quæ *and* fides qua Justificat, *what it meaneth.*

Cont. XIX. *Whether we are Justified by the Law of Innocency, saying, obey perfectly, and live.*

Cont. XX. *Whether by works,* Paul *means acts* in genere, *or what sort of Acts.*

Cont. XXI. *Are any works of man meritorious?*
Cont. XXII. *Is obedience a part of Justifying Faith?*
Cont. XXIII. *Is any more necessary to the keeping or not losing our Justification, than to its beginning?*
Cont. XXIV. *Is Pardon and Justification perfect the first moment?*
Cont. XXV. *Is* nolle punire, *or* non punire, (*not punishing*) *true pardon?*
Cont. XXVI. *Is future sin pardoned before?*
Cont. XXVII. *Is any one punished for pardoned sin?*
Cont. XXVIII. *Is punishing one that Christ died for, unjust punishing one sin twice.*
Cont. XXIX. *Are regenerate believers, under any guilt of any but corrective punishment, or should ask pardon of any other?*
Cont. XXX. *What is it to be judged according to our works?*
Cont. XXXI. *What Law is it that* Paul *calleth the Law of works which cannot justify?*
Cont. XXXII. *How and why it is so called.*
Cont. XXXIII. *What is* Pauls *drift in his disputes about Justification.*
Cont. XXXIV. *What is the drift of* James.
Cont. XXXV. *Must a believer any way plead his Faith, Repentance or Holiness to his Justification, or trust to them?*
Cont. XXXVI. *Hath Justification and Salvation the same conditions? Do those works save us that do not justify us?*

Cont.

Cont. XXXVII. *Have we any Justification against false accusations (of Infidelity, &c.)*

Cont. XXXVIII. *Doth faith justify as a righteousness? or any personal righteousness in subordination to Christs? Abundant Scripture proof of the affirmative.*

Cont. XXXIX. *Is Gods accepting Christs righteousness for us, the imputing of it?*

Cont. XL. *Whether Christs sufferings merit Eternal life for us, seeing the Law said, Do this and live, and not suffer and live.*

Cont. XLI. *Whether Christ being the end of the law for righteousness, prove that* Adams *first law justifieth us as fulfilled by Christ.*

Cont. XLII. *Whether the sufferings of Christ merit our freedom from nothing but what he suffered in our stead.*

Cont. XLIII. *And so whether Christs sufferings merit not our freedom from habits and acts of sin, which Christ had not.*

Cont. XLIV. *And so whether his sufferings redeem us from Spiritual death, seeing we suffered it, and not he.*

Cont. XLV. *Is this the reason of our deliverance from the curse of the law, because we suffered the equivalent of everlasting Hell Fire in Christ.*

Cont. XLVI. *Is it true that Christs active obedience only meriteth Heaven for us, and therefore that only meriteth Sanctification?*

Cont. XLVII. *Is it true that Repentance can*

be no condition of Justification because it followeth it.

Qu. XLVIII. *How can faith and repentance give a right to the righteousness of Christ, which must first give us that faith and repentance?*

Qu. XLIX. *Is it true that we must be practical Antinomians unless we hold that only Christs Active righteousness merited grace and glory for us.*

Qu. L. *Is this proved by,* Rom. 7. 4.

The Conclusion.

A Breviate of the Doctrine of Justification.

Pr. I. WE must first agree, what *Righteousness is. Righteousness* is formally a *Relation*: And therefore must have the definition of a Relation: I need not tell Schollars what that is.

2. The subject of this Relation, is, first mens *actions* and *habits*, and their *Titles* and *Rights*, and then their *Persons* as the subject of these.

3. Righteousness is a Relation to the Rule or Law: And is an Agreeableness thereto: If it be Gods Law, it is Righteousness before God. If but *mans*, it is but humane Righteousness.

4. As a Law hath two parts; the precept and the retribution of reward and punishment, so there are two sorts of unrighteousness and righteousness: As to the precept, Obedience is Righteousness, and Sin is Unrighteousness. As to the Retribution, Right to Impunity and to the promised Reward is the Persons Righteousness, and so contrary.

5. Righteousness materially is either, 1. *Particular*, in some one cause, or few causes: 2. Or *Universal* and perfect in all causes.

6. Righteousness particular is either in some small matter that we are not made happy by. 2. Or in some great cause which our happiness dependeth on.

7. The first Law required personal perfect constant obedience on pain of death; and so justifieth none without it.

8. *Adam* was the Father of all mankind, from whom they ſpring, but he did not ſo repreſent the Perſons of all that were to ſpring of him, as if his obedience without their own would have juſtified any of them at age. If *Adam* had not ſinned, *Cain* ſhould have been condemned if he ſinned; and ſo others.

9. The firſt Law being broken, man was made uncapable of either part of Juſtification by it; either as one that ſinned not, or as one that was not by it to be condemned. And ſo it was no more to him a Promiſe or Covenant of Life; the Condition being now become impoſſible, and ſo no condition; and the threatning becoming as a Sentence.

10. This Law neither gave, mentioned or owned any Surety, Subſtitute, or Mediator.

11. But the bleſſed Lawgiver our Creator would not ſo loſe his Creature, but the eternal word preſently interpoſing, undertook mans Redemption, and God gave man a new Law of Life, or a Covenant of Grace, promiſing him a Mediator in the fullneſs of time, and giving him freely for his ſake both pardon of his ſin, and right to Life, on the Terms of Grace therein preſcribed: and commanding him future obedience, eſpecially in the reception of his Grace, and uſe of the *means* of Grace appointed him.

12. This Law of Grace was made to *Adam* the lapſed head of all mankind, and ſo to all mankind in him: And it was renewed to *Noah* in the ſame capacity: ſo that all fallen mankind was put under this Law of Grace in that firſt Edition of it, made to *Adam*, and *Noah*. And were neither left lawleſs, nor utterly deſperate as under the meer damning violated Law, which now no more offered

Life

Life to any, the condition being become of natural impossibility: God *is* not to be supposed to say now to sinners, *If you be not Sinners you shall live*; when it's known that *they are*.

13. *Abraham*, being eminently righteous, according to this Law of Grace, and Believing a special promise of God, and not withholding his only Son in his obedience to his command, God made with him moreover a Covenant of *peculiarity*, superadded to the common Law of Grace. In which he chuseth out his Seed as a peculiar Holy Nation, from whom the *Messiah* should come, in *whom all the Nations of the Earth should be blessed*. This promise was renewed to *Isaac* (and *Jacob*) Gen. 26. 4, 5. *Because that Abraham obeyed my Voice and kept my Charge, my Commandments, my Statutes, and my Laws.*

14. This Covenant of Peculiarity with *Abraham*, nulled not the common Law of Grace made to mankind, nor was it ever nulled or abrogate, but perfected after: Though men make themselves uncapable of the benefits.

15. God useth none of fallen mankind according to the severity of the first Law, but giveth to all men undeserved forfeited Mercy, and bindeth them to use some means for their recovery; to repent in hope, and to receive and thankfully use the measures of mercy which he vouchsafeth them. And all men shall be judged according to that edition of the Law of Grace which they were under, and the receiving and using the Grace or Mercy which was given or offered them.

16. When the *peculiar Seed* was formed into a *Nation*, God gave them by *Moses* a *peculiar Law*, which exemplified the *Holiness* of the *first Law*, but had the Promises and Grace of the second, with

the peculiar additions; and plainlier pointed out the Messiah to come but by a way of operous Ceremonies, and severe Discipline, suitable to their rude minority.

17. In the fulness of time, Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost, in a Virgin, and being God and Man, as made by the Will of the Deity, was made a Subject under a Law peculiar to himself, according to his peculiar works; and this Law given to our Mediator had three parts. 1. That he should perfectly obey the Law of Innocency so far as it was fitted to his case, and overcome the Tempter. 2. That he should perfectly keep the Law of *Moses*, so far as it agreed to him. 3. That he should perfectly do all that was proper to the Redeemer, in being a Sacrifice for sin, clearing and publishing the New Covenant; sealing it by Miracles, rising again, instituting his Word, Sacraments and Ministry, ascending, giving the Spirit, interceding in Heaven, *&c.* his promised reward being the success of his undertaking, the saving of his Church and his Glory, in the glorifying of God the Father: This is the peculiar Law to the Mediator.

18. That which is called *The Covenant between the Father and the Son*, is this Covenant made to and with *Christ Incarnate*, and the *fore-decreeing* thereof, with the *Prophecies* of it. If there be more, it is past our reach.

19. Christ perfectly fulfilled all that he undertook, and this as the second *Adam*; not a Natural Root, but a Voluntary Sponsor: Not our Substitute or Servant sent by us, but chosen by the Father, and sent by him to do all his Will for Mans Redemption.

20. As he took the common Nature of Man, so the

the sins of all, and not only of the Elect were the *causes* of his sufferings, and laid upon him, and the *fruits* of his sufferings and merits were some common, and some peculiar to the Elect.

21. He being not as *Adam*, our natural Parent, was not meerly by natural generation to convey his benefits to the Redeemed; but by such means as he should chuse, and Man consent to, even by a holy Covenant or Contract, being also his Doctrine, and his Law in several respects; which Covenant having great and precious Promises, is Gods Instrument of Donation and Condonation, and our title to all the blessings promised; by which God doth give us right to Pardon and Salvation: This Law of Grace is the Rule of our duty, and the Rule by which we shall be judged.

22. This Law or Covenant giveth a Conditional Pardon to all in the tenour of it, with Adoption and Right to Life Eternal: But actual Pardon and Right accrueth to none, till the Condition be performed, which is to be Believers, or their Infant seed dedicated to God by Covenant Consent.

23. This Condition is not that we our selves make God amends or satisfaction, or give him any thing that hath any merit in Commutative Justice, or do any kind of work which shall make the reward to be of debt, and not of grace: But it is [*the Belief of, and Consent to the Covenant of Grace, and the Believing Acceptance of the gifts and grace of the Covenant, according to their nature, and for their proper use*; and is the same thing which is to be professed in *Baptism*, which is the solemnizing of this mutual Covenant, and in which God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, do give themselves to us, for grace and glory, and we give up our selves

by

by consent to him, believingly accepting his grace, and penitently renouncing the lusts of the flesh, the world and the Devil; and so are sacramentally invested in a state of Justification, Adoption and Spiritual Life.

24. The profession of this *Faith and Consent* in Baptism, maketh men visible Christians and Church-members; and *true heart-consent in Faith* maketh men *Living and Justified* Members.

25. This belief and consent, or performance of the Condition, is not the Efficient Cause of our Pardon or Justification, but is the *necessary disposition or qualification of the Receiver, in the very nature of the Act suitable and needful, and by Divine Institution and Promise made the Condition and acceptable.*

26. Though we are not capable Receivers of Justification, till we thus penitently and believingly consent, yet when we do so, it is the *merit of Christ's Righteousness* by which we *are justified:* For the Covenant of God is but his Instrument by which he giveth us Christ (to be our Head) and Life in and with him, and so giveth us *Justification as procured by his Merits.*

27. Justification is a word of many senses: sometimes it signifieth [*making us righteous*] sometimes, the *Law* or *Covenants virtual judging us righteous*, it being the *Rule of Judgment:* sometimes Gods *esteeming* us righteous in *his own mind:* sometimes for a *Justifying by Evidence or Witness:* sometimes by *Apology* of an Advocate: sometimes by the *Sentence of the Judge*: and sometime for the *Execution* of that *Sentence.* But the notable special sorts are three, *Making just, Judging just, and Using as just:* And they that will dispute of Justification, and not tell in what sense they take the word, do but abuse their time and talk.

28. No

28. No man is *judged* righteous by God, that is not first *made righteous*.

29. He that is *made righteous*, is *justifiable* in *Judgment*, and *virtually justified* (in Law.)

30. No sinner is *made righteous* as to the *Preceptive part of the Law of Innocency*; it being a contradiction to have been a sinner and no sinner.

31. Pardon of sin doth not make the fact done to be *undone*, or *not done*, nor the sin to be *no sin*, nor not to have deserved punishment: But it remitteth the *punishment* and the *fault*, so far as it inferreth punishment, because of the merit and satisfaction of the Mediator; and delivereth the sinner from that which he was bound to suffer by the violated Law.

32. To make a man righteous before God that hath sinned, all these things must concur: 1. He must have a *Mediator that must answer the Ends of the Law that condemneth him*, and so *meriteth* his Justification. 2. This Saviour must make him a *Pardoning and Justifying Covenant*, to convey the right of the purchased benefits to him. 3. *He himself (by grace) must perform the Conditions of that Covenant; accepting the free gift believingly according to its nature and use.* 4. Upon this the *Covenant* (by virtue of the foresaid *Merit of the Mediator*) *must effectually justifie him.*

33. Though we have no Righteousness of our own, that is so denominated by the *Law of Innocency*, yet have we a Righteousness to plead for our *Justification from its Sentence*, which by our Mediator was performed to it, by which the *Lawgiver* hath received satisfaction; and we must have the *personal subordinate Righteousness* required by the Covenant of Grace.

34. All that are *made righteous*, *are esteemed and judged righteous, and used as righteous.* 35. *Par-*

35. *Pardon of Sin*, and *Right to Life*, are not that Righteousness which answereth the *Precept* of the Law: But they are that Righteousness which justifieth us against the Accusation, [*that we are not to be saved, but to be damned.*]

35. Christs *Perfect Obedience* to the Law of Innocency, exempteth us from the necessity of perfect obedience to it, and from all duty of obeying it as the condition of life: But he did not *Repent and Believe* in obedience to his *own Law of Grace*, to exempt us from the necessity of *Repenting and Believing*, which we must do our selves by his grace, or perish.

36. To *make a man righteous* implieth, that he was before unrighteous: But to *judge* him righteous, supposeth him to be *righteous*; yet either *accused* of unrighteousness, or *accusable*; Justification here supposing either *actual* or *virtual* Accusation.

37. The *Law* is the *Virtual Accuser*, but that speaketh nothing but truth; (*viz.* that we *sinned and deserved damnation.*) Satan is the *Actual Accuser*, and *the Father of Lies.*

38. We shall not be justified by denying the true Accusation of the Law, but by denying the false Accusation of Satan: That we *are sinners* must be granted; and that our sin *deserved Hell*: But (that we *have no part in Christ*, that we are unpardoned, unreconciled sinners, that we are *unbelievers*, *impenitent*, *unregenerate*, *unholy*, or *hypocrites*, must be denied, or we perish: As also that hereupon *we ought to be damned, and not to be glorified.*

39. By this it is very plain how far a man must be justified in Judgment by his own personal Righteousness; and also how to understand, *Matth.* 25. and all the descriptions of the last Judgment, and the Reasons there assigned of the Sentence; and what

it

it is to be Justified or Condemned by our words, and to be judged according to our works, or what we have done in obedience or disobedience to the Law of grace; and what is meant in *James* by being justified by works, and not by faith alone. For though *Christs righteousness* is to be then *honoured*, it is not *his part*, but *ours*, that is by him to be *Examined* and *Judged*. And it is the *Law of Grace* by which we must be judged, which prescribed us the Conditions of Pardon and Salvation. The performance of which must therefore be the cause of the day to be Examined and Judged.

4. To justify a mans *Right to Salvation* is to justify the *man* when his right is the thing tried: Therefore the causes of our *Right to Salvation* are necessary causes of our *Justification*. All this is plain, and I think, not by a Christian to be denied: And is not here enough to be the matter of our Christian peace *and concord in this one point of Justification*. But we are not so happy; It is a greater number of Controversies that the teachers of Christians have raised about it, than many hours will serve to handle. I will name some that are too many, and yet far from all, and give you my sense of them plainly and briefly, that you may truly understand the matter and me.

Cont. 1. Passing by all the old quarrels, about Christs Person, by the *Arrians*, *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, *Monothelites*, *Phantasiastæ*, and abundance more, about Justification it self, the first that I shall mention is that which a few great and worthy men have unhappily raised, *Whether Justification be not an Immanent act* in God, *and so eternal*: This they assert, and I deny: There is nothing in God but God; Nothing therefore that hath beginning and end,

end, but all is Eternal. But *Relations and Extrinsick denominations*, and also *Effects* may begin and end. The world was not from Eternity: God did not make it from Eternity, nor was the creator of it from Eternity, in proper speech. And yet no Act as it is in God had beginning or end; for it is God himself. But Gods Essential will or word is not called *creating* till it actually create. So is it in Justification: Nothing is new in God, besides *Relation* and *Denomination*; but much is new *by and from God*. Justification is a transient act of God. It is the act of his *Covenant* and his *Judgment* and *Execution*. Therefore he that saith Elect Infidels are justified from Eternity, Contradicteth Gods word, that saith we are justified by faith, and till then are under Condemnation.

Cont. 2. *Whether* the *Covenant* of *Grace*, *be made only with Christ*, or *with us also*? The first is put into a Catechism where I am sorryer to find it, than in *Maccovius*, *Cluto*, *Cocceius* and *Cloppenburgius*. The Covenant made with Christ is not the same that is made between Christ and us, and which we celebrate in Baptism. It is not only *Christ* that is *baptized*, but all his members; And *baptism* is the *mutual Covenant*. We are the *receivers* of the *Relation to God the Father*, *Son and Holy Ghost*, and *we* are the *Promisers* (the word *Restipulation* is too presumptuous.) If we are not *Covenanters*, we can be no *Covenant breakers*, nor have right to the benefits of such a Covenant: It is the same thing that in several respects is called a Law and a Covenant. And if we are not under Christs Law we are Lawless, or not his Subjects. Deny Christs Law and Covenant to us, and you will subvert all Christianity and deny the rule of Judgment and Justification.

Cont.

Cont. 3. *Whether the Covenant of grace have any condition required of us.*

Anſ. Here we firſt ſhew our weakneſs in contending about the word [*Condition*] while we agree not of the ſenſe, though till men made a *difference* on this ill occaſion, there were few words that men were more agreed in (of ſuch a Subject.) And the word we muſt uſe, hath no other name that I remember which our Grammar hath taught us to call, ſuch Conjunctions by as [*If*] is, but [*Conditional*] nor any other name that Law and Civil uſe hath taught us to call the thing defined by but [*CONDITION*] without circumlocution, uncouthneſs or obſcurity. The common definition of Lawyers is that it is, [*Lex addita negotio qua donec præſtetur eventum ſuſpendit*: It is in our caſe the *Mode* of the *Law* or *Promiſe requiring a Duty or Moral Act* or *qualification*, *on the preſence or abſence*, *performance or non-performance whereof the Law or Donation annexeth or ſuſpendeth the event*. This is a *Condition* as it is in the, *Law* or *Covenant*, or *Promiſe*, being but its *Modus*: But as it is in the *perſon* and *performance*, it is a *Moral Act* or *qualification*, required by the Law, or Promiſe, to *which it annexeth*, and till it be *performed ſuſpendeth the event*. Natural or meerly contingent conditions that are not moral, belong not to our enquiry. (As if it be a fair day to morrow. If ſuch a ſhip come ſafe home! If I live ſo long, *&c.*)

Some define a condition here to be any *Moral medium* of *obtaining a benefit ex pacto*: But 1. A Law hath its conditions, and ſo hath a Donation or promiſe, when there is no proper mutual *pactum* or Covenant. 2. There are other Moral *media ex pacto* beſides conditions (as are all ſimple duties.) 3. But

theſe

these definers cannot congruously deny the Gospel Covenant of grace to have *conditions* of our *Justification* and *Salvation*: For none but an Infidel can congruously deny that Faith and Repentance are conditions of our Justification and Salvation, if every Moral *medium* be a condition which is *ex pacto*. Is faith, and is repentance no means? And are they not required of us? and do we not profess them at present and promise them for the future?

Sometimes the same thing is a *moral cause* and a *Condition* of the Event. And sometimes it is a *meer Condition* and but *sine quâ non*, and no proper cause; usually in Moral *Conditions* there is something in the Nature of the matter for the sake of which the Donor or Lawgiver maketh it necessary; which is its *aptitude* as a means to some of his ends.

If *Faith* had no more fitness to be the condition of Justification than *Unbelief* or *hating God*, and if *Godliness* or *Holiness* had no more fitness to be the Condition of our Salvation than *wickedness*, they would not have been deputed to this place, Office and Honour.

Faith is no Condition of Gods *making the promise* (He *absolutely made some Conditional promises*, and others only on *conditions performed by Christ*.) But it is the condition of our right to or possession of the thing promised; or of the event.

Either the deniers of conditions deny all or but *some*. If *all* then they deny that Christ performed any conditions. If but some, they deny either the *name* only, or the *thing* also. If the *name* only. 1. Is it worth their Zeal and Contention? 2. Are they not singular; and singularity in the use of words tendeth to causless quarrels. 3. Why do they not commend to us some better name for the same thing? Grammar and common use hath taught us this. Dr. *Twisse* hath found another, oft and oft saying

saying that [*Faith is a dispositive cause of Justification.*] I dislike not his notion, save that, 1. It is too general there being more dispositive causes besides Conditions. 2. That it is not *Political* enough as the Subject requireth (or Civil.) 3. That it is in two words when one is better; and 4. That the very terms [*Cause*] is liable to mistake. For faith is no *efficient cause* of Justification, principal nor instrumental: We must not ascribe so much to it. Nor is it a final *cause*, nor the *formal cause*. But it is as the Dr. speaketh *Dispositio Subjecti recipientis*: Not a natural, but *Moral disposition*; Yet made such by Gods institution, because the very *nature* of the act containeth a *fitness* to its receptive Office; even as it is the believing acceptance of such a free and wonderful gift to such special ends and uses.

2. But if it be not the *Name* only but the *thing* defined that is denied the *Gospel* is denied, and that which is of necessity to Salvation is denied. To deny faith to be *necessary to Pardon, Justification and Salvation* as *a moral means congruous in its nature* and *instituted* of *God*, is *Infidelity* or open prophaneness: Nor can those be meet Preachers of the Gospel that deny it and oppose it.

Two ways Scripture sheweth that Justification and Salvation are given conditionally. 1. By the plain Conditional Phrase, and 2. By the conditional description, in the mode of the promise: To instance in a few Texts among a multitude, *Mar.* 16. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.*

Rom. 4. 25. *To whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.*

Rom. 10. 9, 10. *For if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thy heart that*

God raised him from the dead, thou shall be saved. For with the heart man believeth to righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto Salvation.

Joh. 1. 12. *To as many as received him to them gave he power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe in his name.*

Joh. 3. 19. 18, 16. *Joh.* 6. throughout.

Mat. 6. 14. 15. If ye forgive *men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will forgive you. But if ye forgive not,* &c.

Luk. 13. 3, 5. *Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish.*

Acts 10. 35. *In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him.*

Acts 8. 37. *If thou believest with all thy heart thou maist,* (*i.e.* Be baptized for the remission of sins.)

But I have recited so many Texts of this sort in my *Confession* and *other* books, that I will here forbear unnecessary recitals. *Mat.* 5. alone may suffice, and all the Texts that say, *Faith is imputed for or to righteousness, and that we are justified by it.*

Furthermore; 1. If the Baptismal Covenant have no condition, then none is to be prerequired in the person to be baptized, nor his promise of any demanded. But the consequent is false: Else the baptism instituted by Christ and ever practised in the Church is false.

And here you see what a Baptism these men would make: If they practice it according to this principle; and how they would overthrow our Christianity, and baptize Infidels.

The major is evident, because, where no condition is required of God or imposed, there none should be required or imposed by the Minister. And if so in *Baptism*, why not also

in

in *Absolution* and the *Lords Supper*.

2. If the Promise of Pardon and Justification be Absolute without any condition, then either to *All men*, or but to *some*. If to All, then all are justified. If but *to some*, to whom? If you say *to the Elect*; no man knoweth them, while they are unbelievers: and so neither the Person nor the Minister can apply that Promise to any singular man: If you say, *To Believers*, you grant Faith to be a *necessary*, *moral antecedent*: And if so, whence can you imagine it to be such, but *Aptitudinally* in the *Nature of the Act* (*receiving Christ*, which some call it's *Instrumentality*) and *Actually* by Gods Institution in the Tenor of his Word: Now this is 1. In the Tenor or Mode of the *Precept*, and that maketh it a *Duty*. 2. In the Tenor or Mode of the *Promise*, and that maketh it *it's Condition*: In what other respect do they (exclusively) feign it necessary?

Obj. *As an Antecedent?* *Ans.* That speaketh but the *Order*: But what Antecedent is it?

Obj. *As a sign?* *Ans.* Of what? and why Is it as a sign of *Election?* But *Holiness*, the *Love of God*, and *man*, &c. are *signs* of Election, and yet not prerequisite to baptism and pardon. And whence is it that this sign of Election is prerequisite, but that Gods *precept* made it a *duty*, and the *promise* a *condition?* Grant it a sign, the question is still of the reason of this signs *necessity* to *Justification*. 3. If *Signification* be the thing necessary, it must be either to *God*, to the *Sinner*, or to the *Baptizer*. Not to *God*, that needs no notice by signs: and so it would follow that before God Elect Infidels are justified, which is false, as is oft proved: And to the *Minister* it is not certainly known: Nor may he baptize any meerly as *Elect*, if he could know

it (by revelation) before Faith. Nor might such a person *claim* it, Nor do *believers* usually at the very first know their Election. It's pity that any catechized person should be so ignorant as to deny so plain a Truth as it is that the *Promise* maketh Faith antecedently neeessary to Justification under the form of an *apt condition*; when no used phrase can speak the thing to us so intelligibly and truly as this doth.

Obj. *It is prerequisite as an Instrument? Anſ.* Of this I shall speak by it self anon. By an *Instrument* I hope when considered they will not mean any proper *efficient Instrument* of Justification (Though in exciting, the acts of Sanctification in us it may be called our Instrument and Gods by us:) But justifying is wholly and only Gods Act, and the *Covenant* as an Act of oblivion, and Grace is *his Instrument giving us our Right to impunity and Life*, (in which our Constitutive, Justification doth consist) But they mean a *Metaphorical Receiving* Instrument, and to *receive Christ* is but the very essence of Faith, which they call the *Tò credere*, and so to be justified by Faith as it *receiveth Christ*, and as a *receiving Instrument*, and as it is the *Tò credere in specie*, are all one. And all this is true, if you ask but for what *Natural aptitude God made* Faith the *Condition* of Justification: And it's more aptly called by the foresaid Dr. *Causa dispositiva*; and yet more aptly *dispositio receptiva moralis*, necessary and successful, *aptitudinally* in its *Nature*, and *Actually* by the tenor of *Gods Promise* or Donation, making it a Condition: that is, saying [*He that believeth shall be justified and saved, and he that doth not*] *be damned.*] If God had not given Christ and L oy a Promise of this Tenor, [*If thou believe thou shalt have Christ and Life,*] it's aptitude would have had

had no use. If the King by an Act of Oblivion say [*All Rebels and Malefactors that thankfully come and take out their pardon, and lay down arms shall live, and the rest shall be unpardonable.*] Here, 1. The Act of Oblivion is the pardoning Instrument, and the receivers Title and *fundamentum juris.* 2. The Reception is made a Condition by the Act being the *modus donandi seu condonandi.* 3. Next this Condition is performed. 4. And next the effect followeth from it's proper efficient causes, *e. g.* suppose, 1. The Kings Clemency. 2. His Sons Intercession. 3. The Act of Oblivions Instrumentality. 4. The Offenders performing the Condition, which doth but make him a capable Receiver of the Effect. 5. And lastly, the Ministers instrumental applicatory sealing, delivering and investiture. This is all plain, to men that by prejudice fight not against the light.

And that the Promises of Salvation, or Glory (and perseverance) have their Conditions, I will not for shame and tediousness stand to prove to such as you.

Obj. *But he that performeth a Condition may boast and ascribe somewhat to himself.*

Ans. 1. I find many that thus argue the proneſt of most Christians to boast of, or to defend their honour and the honour of their party against any that would vilifie them; and do ascribe something to them, even to be the best sort of men. 2. God boasteth of his Servants, and ascribeth much to them, *viz.* to have his Image, the divine nature, to be the Salt and Lights of the Earth, his Jewels, the Apple of his Eye, *&c.* He bids them turn themselves, save themselves and work out their Salvation, and keep themselves in his Love and continue in his Love, *&c.* 3. If saying that

they *believe and repent*, and give up themselves to God in Christ be culpable boasting, then all that have been baptized on such a required profession, have thereby sinned, and all the Christian baptism hath been sin. 4. No man is a Christian, justified, or can be saved that cannot so boast (that he is not an Infidel, but a Penitent Believer.) 5. Is it a matter of boasting that God commandeth when he commandeth us to repent and believe the Gospel? If he freely pardon condemned Sinners for the sake of Christs Sacrifice, Righteousnes and Intercession, on Condition, that they do not finally refuse the gift, but believingly accept it according to it's Nature, and all this by his Grace; is this matter of boasting? May a pardoned Traytor boast of his Merit to the King, if the Condition of his pardon be, that he shall not refuse it, and spit in the Kings face, or continue a rebel?

Obj. *Where all is of Grace, and Faith it self given and promised by the Covenant, there the Covenant is not Conditional.*

Anſ 1. As to the giving of Faith, it well stands with Gods method both to Command it as a duty, and to make it a Condition of his Promise, and to give his Word and Spirit to cause us to perform it. It is a fiction that these may not consist, and he subverteth the Gospel that saith they do not consist. 2. As to the Promise, God indeed hath promised to Christ, to give him a seed, and to draw them to him, *&c.* But the Covenant made with particular men, and sealed and solemnized in baptism doth not promise *Faith* and *Repentance*, which are first given, but prerequire them as the necessary qualification of the adult. And this is the Covenant that we speak of. 3. It is a *Condition* of *Pardon*, *Justification* and *Acceptance*, that

we

we enquire of. Therefore it is the *Promise of these* that we must mean: Now I ask whether the *Promise of Pardon* and *Justification* be a *Promise of Faith*, or whether it be not a Promise to *pardon and justifie Believers* only and their Seed, and so prerequireth Faith.

Obj. *But you call the many parts of one Covenant by the name of many Covenants.* *Anſ.* I hope we shall not be called in matters of Catechism to Metaphysical or Logical quibbles *de Unitate & Individuatione.* Which is too hard for mens wits about things natural or moral. That is *one* in some respect which is *many* in others. There is some sort of *Unity* of all the Universe, even of all Creatures: And so there is of all Gods Laws and Covenants: either the Objectiors speak *de nomine or de re:* If but of the *Name* [*One,*] they shall call it *One* if that will please them, and let them only distinguish the *Parts* of that *One:* If they will say that the Covenant made by the *Father* with the *Mediator*, and the Law made for him, are one and the same with the Covenant made by the Father and Son and Holy Spirit with us, and that our Baptismal Covenant is no Covenant, but only a part of the Covenant of which that with Christ aforesaid is another part, I will not use their phrase, but let me understand them that it is only the Name of [*One or Two*] that they contend about, and we will fit our words accordingly: I think on several accounts they are to be called *Divers Covenants*: If they dislike it, let us enquire whether the various Precepts of one Covenant make not various duties to Christ and to us; and whether the various Promises of it have not various *Conditions*, some to be performed by Christ and some by us. Our present Question is, Whether that part of the

Covenant which promiseth and giveth Pardon of sin, Justification, Adoption, and right to Glory, have any Condition, as the *Modus* of the gift? We will rather follow them in unmeet terms, than leave them thence a pretence to confound names and things, and hide their errour by the confusion.

All Divines, ancient and modern, reformed and and unreformed, that I know of, agreed with us in the conditionality of the said Promise, and by the form of Baptism shewed the Churches consent till *Maccovius* in *Holland*, and Dr. *Crispe* and other Antinomians in *England* began to subvert the Gospel on pretence of magnifying the freeness of Grace; and yet they durst never attempt to alter the Form of Baptism; as this Opinion will require.

Contr. 4. By what hath been said, the fourth Controversie is already resolved; *viz. Whether our performance of the Condition of Justification doth efficiently justifie us?* Some say, because we say that Christ doth not justifie us till we perform the condition by believing, that therefore we make our own Faith or performance to justifie proximately, and Christ but remotely, and so to do more than Christ to our Justification.

Ans. 1. As to the phrase, Scripture saith, that *we are justified by Faith*, that word not signifying an *efficiency*, but a *receptive* qualifying condition; but it never saith, that *Faith doth justifie us*, much less that we by it justifie our selves: Our performance or Faith is no efficient cause; but as to two parts of our Justification it hath a twofold Office: 1. As to our Justification by the Merits of Christs Righteousness against this charge [*that damnation is due*

to

to us for sin] our *Faith* is the *Condition* of our *Pardon and Justification*; that is, the moral qualification which God hath made necessary to make us capable receivers of it: As laying down Arms, and taking his Pardon thankfully, may make a Rebel capable of Pardon (but doth not pardon him) if the pardoning Act say [*This shall be the Condition:*] And by his *Pardon* he is *justifiable* against the charge of being liable to death.

2. But as to the *subordinate* part of *Justification*, against the false charge that *we are no Believers*, nor *repent*, and so have *no part in Christ*; here our own Faith is the very Matter of Righteousness by which we must be *in tantum* (so far) justified: As truth and innocency is against every false accusation: And to say that because Christs Merits justifie us not before and without our Faith and performance of the Condition, therefore *our Act justifieth us* more than Christ, or efficiently at all, is a thing unworthy of an answer, being below the thoughts of an intelligent Disputer. How much the capacity or incapacity of the Receiver doth as to all the various changes in the world, both physical and moral, when yet efficiently it doth nothing, is not wholly unknown to any sober thinking man. As the same sun-shine maketh a Weed stink, and a Rose sweet; so the same Act of Oblivion, or conditional Justifying Law or Covenant, doth justifie the capable, and not the uncapable, though no mans Faith doth effect any part of his own Justification. Mr. *Troughton*, and such others denying Faith to be the Condition of our Justification by the Promise, hath drawn me to speak the largelier of this.

Contr.

Contr. 5. *Whether we are justified by Christs Righteousness imputed to us: and whether the Scripture say so.*

Anſ. The Scripture oft ſaith, that *Faith is imputed to us for Righteouſneſs*; and that is, Faith in Chriſt: And it ſaith, that *Righteouſneſs is imputed, or reckoned to us*, that is, we are reckoned or reputed righteous, *Rom.* 4. 11, 22. 6. And that *ſin is not imputed*, that is not charged on us to puniſhment, or damnation, *Rom.* 5. 13. & 4. 8. *Pſal.* 32. *v.* 2. 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. The words of *Imputing Chriſts Righteouſneſs to us, I find not in Gods Word*, and therefore think them not neceſſary to the Churches peace or ſafety. But as for the ſenſe of thoſe words no doubt but it may be good, & the Papiſts themſelves own them in the ſame ſenſe as many Proteſtant Divines *profeſs to uſe them, as Ihave proved.*

Contr. 6. *In what ſenſe is Chriſts Righteouſneſs imputed to us?*

Anſw. It is accounted of God the valuable conſideration, ſatisfaction and merit (attaining Gods ends) for which we are (when we conſent to the Covenant of Grace,) forgiven and juſtified againſt the condemning Sentence of the Law of Innocency, and reconciled and accepted of God to Grace and Glory.

Q. *But did not Chriſt repreſent our perſons in his Righteouſneſs, ſo that it is imputed to us as ours, as if we our ſelves had been and done what he was and did as righteous?*

Anſ. This being the very heart of all the Controverſie, ſhould be decided only by Scripture, and nothing added or diminiſhed. That Chriſt is the ſecond *Adam*, and called ἔγγυος, a Sponſor, Surety or

or Interposer, and a Mediator between God and Man, that suffered for us, the just for the unjust, a price, and a sacrifice, is all found in scripture. Wise and peaceable men here will be as fearful of humane Inventions and Additions as in Discipline or Ceremonies at least. But because all are not such, we must speak to men as they are. There are several sorts of Sureties or Sponsors.

Few *represent the very person*, at least not all: If men will needs impose on us their own word of *Representation*, for peace sake we accept it, in a sound sense. In a limited sense it is true that Christ *represented us*; that is, he suffered in our stead, that we might not suffer: He obeyed, and was perfectly righteous as Mediator in our *Natures*, and so far in our stead, as that such perfect Righteousness should not in our selves be necessary to our Justification. But he did not *absolutely* represent us; he was not our Delegate: Our persons did not in a Law-sense do in and by Christ what he did, or possess the habits which he possessed, or suffered what he suffered: Nor doth God account us so to have done, for that were to mistake. I have rendred a multitude of reasons to prove this in my Treatise of *Justifying Righteousness*: The contradiction is enough that we are accounted never to have sinned, because Christ never sinned; and yet we are accounted to have suffered or satisfied for sin, because Christ did so; or at least that we need a pardon by his blood, and must ask for pardon, and must suffer correcting punishments, and long be without necessary grace and glory, when yet we are accounted never to have sinned, but from birth to death to have fulfilled all Gods Law in Christ. I have fully proved that this Doctrine subverteth the sum of all the Gospel and Religion, to which I refer you.

Contr.

Contr. 7. *What Righteousness of Christ is it that is ours, and imputed to us, the Passive, the Active, the Habitual, or the Divine, or all?*

Answ. Divines are here fallen into four Opinions.

I. Many of our most famous Divines say, that it is only Christs sufferings that are imputed to us as our Righteousness to Justification; being *Justitia Meriti*, the rest being *Justitia Personæ*, to qualifie Christ to merit for us. Thus *Paræus*, *Scultetus*, *Wendeline*, *Beckman*, *Ursine*, *Piscator*, *Olevian*, *Camero* with his followers, and many more: These are far from thinking that we fulfilled all the Law in Christ, or are righteous because he fulfilled it.

II. The second sort think that the Active and Passive Righteousness are imputed to us as our Righteousness.

III. The third sort are for the Passive, Active and Habitual imputed.

IV. The fourth think so also of the Divine, (which is the Deity it self; for there is nothing in God but God) *Andrew Osiander* is for our Justification by the Divine Essence, but I think rather by Communication than Imputation. Thus hath our weakness distracted and disgraced us. But Mr. *Bradshaw* truly noted, that if the sense of *Imputation* were well agreed of, the rest might well be reconciled; *viz.* that no Righteousness of Christ is imputed to us in the strict sense of Representation, as if we our selves were legally accounted to have been done or suffered, what Christ did, was and suffered. But in the just sense of Imputation all is imputed to us, that is, Christs Habitual, Active and Passive Righteousness, fulfilling his own part of the Covenant, advanced in dignity

dignity by the Union of the Divine nature and perfection was the true meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification, and not any one of theſe alone.

Cont. 8. *Whether Chriſts righteouſneſs be the efficient, material* or *formal cauſe of our Righteouſneſs and Juſtification.*

Anſ. Its pity that poor people muſt be thus tempted with Controverſies of Logick. But what remedy? Chriſts righteouſneſs as *materially and formally* his, merited our *Juſtification*: But for the accidental relation of righteouſneſs in Chriſt, to be the accidental relation of righteouſneſs to every believer, is impoſſible unleſs the Subject be the ſame: If Chriſt be the believing ſinner, and as many perſons as there be ſuch, or all theſe be the *ſame perſon* with Chriſt, then his individual righteouſneſs is formally theirs, elſe not. For as *noxa caput ſequitur*, ſo no accident is the ſame numerically in various Subjects. They that deny this wanted but the ſame advantages to have believed Tranſubſtantiation, and renounce the common principles.

But that Chriſts righteouſneſs is the meritorious cauſe of ours, is paſt doubt. And therefore they that affirm and they that deny it to be the *material cauſe* (which is the common Doctrine of Proteſtant diſputers) do but differ about a name. For if *Adam* had merited his own glorification had not his works been both the meritorious cauſe, and the material? that is, the matter of that meritorious righteouſneſs: And why may we not ſay ſo of Chriſt? It is therefore the *material* becauſe it is the *meritorious*, that is, the *meriting matter*. For righteouſneſs being a Relation hath ſtrictly no

matter

matter, but a *Subject*. And Christs *Acts and habits* were the first *Subject* of that righteousness of his person whose merit justifieth us: But the *believer* is the *Subject* of *his own personal righteousness* thus merited by Christ. It's pity that holy things should be brought down to such Logical trifling; but more pity that Church teachers that will do so, should abuse them by their ignorance in their own way. The *matter* of the righteousness which meriteth our Justification from the Laws damnation of us, is Christs own righteousness; (unless by the matter you mean the Subject person.) But the *matter* of our subordinate righteousness is in and of our selves, of which anon.

Cont. 9. *Whether the Union between Christ and believers be not so near, as maketh them the same Subject, and so the accident of Christs righteousness to be ours?*

Ans. So some think, but this tremendous mystery must not be rashly and profanely handled. In a Union Specifick of humanity, all mankind is one with Christ that is, of one Species of humane nature: And so that which is predicated of one as such, is predicated of the other.

In a *Political Union* Christ as the head, and the Church as the body make one Society as *parts* constituting the whole. And so whatever is predicated of a *part* meerly as a *part*, is predicable of both: But that which is predicated of the whole as a whole is properly predicable of neither alone: And that which is predicated of the Head as a head, is not predicable of the body, nor that of the head, which is proper to the body, nor that of one member which is proper to another. But some things by way of Communication may be predicated

cated of the whole, for the ſake of a part. So the Church is called ſinful and imperfect for our ſake, though Chriſt be not ſo: And it is eminently holy and glorious, becauſe Chriſt is ſo; that is, *ſecundum quid.*

But no *Union* will make us *righteous* and perſonally *happy* by anothers righteouſneſs and happineſs, unleſs it were a perſonal Union, (natural or Legal at leaſt as to Relative rights.) The queſtion then is whether *every believer be one perſon with Chriſt?* And if ſo, whether one *natural perſon*, or one *Legal* (as a lawful *vicarius* is.) They that hold the firſt plead that the ſame Spirit that is in Chriſt, is the ſame divine nature, and maketh us one natural perſon. But where doth the Scripture ſay ſo? The Sun is not one Individual with every Plant that it quickeneth, nor every plant with it. A nettle or roſe is not the Sun, nor is it the illuminater of the World, that maketh day, *&c.* But they have ſo much from the Sun as it communicateth, and no more. So we are not Chriſt, nor the Eternal and Natural Son of God, nor infinite in Wiſdom and Goodneſs, nor perfectly juſt and glorified, as Chriſt is: But we have from Chriſt ſo much of the Spirit as he communicateth; And nothing is ours meerly becauſe it is his, and we one perſon with him; but becauſe he Communicateth it to us: What further real Union there will be in our glorious perfection we cannot well know till we are there. But in this imperfection our Union is not ſuch as far as I underſtand it, as maketh us one natural perſon with Chriſt; And ſurely it doth not make his proper accidents to be our accidents.

And as to that which ſome call a Legal or Reputative perſonal Union, it muſt be proved before it

is

is asserted. And as I know no word of God that speaketh such a thing, as that Christ and we are imputatively one person; so I know that they that will assent it of their own heads, presume far in a tender point; and if they should say that we are *simply* and *ad omnia* one person, it were not by Christian ears to be endured: If they will say that it is but in some respects and to some certain uses, (as a Servant that payeth his Masters creditor by order in some sense representeth him in that one action) they must limit it carefully and shew to what uses we are one person, lest they do they know not what: And they must shew what sort of person they mean? Whether Christ be made the same person with each believing sinner, and so take our bad denominations; or each sinner be made the person of Christ; and have his glorious denominations, or a third sort of person is made of both, and what that is? If meer personal Unity make us righteous by imputation, because Christ is so, either it must be as Christ is righteous, in full perfection (reputatively) or else but according to the measure of our receptivity: The first none will affirm that understand what they say: And the second brings the effect no higher than we grant; The foot doth not understand as the head doth, though it be a part of the same natural body, and may have its peculiar Ulcers and Diseases: A crab and a sweet apple may grow on the same Tree: Certainly we have a person proper to our selves, which hath its own defects and evils, and hath no more from Christ than he communicateth.

Cont. 10. *Are we not righteous by being one with Christ, as we are sinners by Union with* Adam?

Ans. 1. We were but seminally and virtually in

in *Adam*, and not personally (as I have opened in my dispute. Of Original sin:) And so we were but virtually in Christ when he suffered and obeyed, and we were unborn.

2. Nay our derivation from *Adam* was by *nature*, but from Christ by his *voluntary Gift and Contract*.

3. Had we not sinned in *Adam*, and yet had sinned our selves we had been unrighteous: And so it is, though we sinned not in Christ, and yet are sinners our selves against him.

Our radical righteousness in *Adam* would have happily disposed us to personal obedience; as *Adam* himself was who yet fell: And our radical righteousness in Christ, is yet a more happy preparative to our necessary duty to him, which is righteousness also, which he that hath not shall be condemned. I know that many say that if *Adam* had conquered that temptation, or at least had never sinned, all his posterity should have been confirmed against all future sin and danger as the Angels be in Heaven: But I dare not add to the Word of God; and I find no such thing there, though I hear what others say: And if that were true, the first Covenant would have ceased upon *Adams* obedience, as it did upon his disobedience, and all the World would have been under either no Law, or some Law to us unknown. The first *Adam was a living Soul*, indeed, and the second is *a quickning Spirit*. And as *in* Adam *all die*, *so in Christ shall all be made alive*, *but every man in his own order*. And as we are not raised, nor yet delivered from all *our sin* or *misery* by our Union with Christ as soon as we believe, so neither from all *guilt* and unrighteousness; but must daily pray, *forgive us our trespasses*, and *deliver* us *from* the *evil*. If our Union

 presently

presently made all *ours* that is *Christs*, and that *as it is his*, yea or as much as we need it, we were then highly dignified indeed. Marriage giveth the Wife her self no further propriety in the Husbands Estate nor use of it, than he communicateth by the contract: And neither that nor generation itself, give Wife or Child the Husbands or Fathers learning, innocence or health.

Cont. 11. *Is not Christs righteousness ours, as our sins were his, by imputation?*

Ans. Yes, As much at least, or more. But take heed of making Christs Gospel by your mending it, and of making him no Christ while you would make him more merciful according to your own conceits. I know it is said once that he was *made sin for us*, who *knew no sin*, that *we might be made* the *righteousness of God in him*. But as we are not properly *righteousness*, much less Gods righteousness, but are made righteous, and so the instances or demonstrations of the righteousness of God; so expositors commonly agree that by *sin* is meant a *Sacrifice for sin*. Or by being [*made sin*] is meant being *used as if he had been a sinner*. Undoubtedly if God imputed or accounted Christ a sinner, and if he were truly so by any means, practice or translation, he must be by sin hateful to the most holy God, (even to himself) and would have in him so great a part of Hell, and Divine desertion, as is not consistent with his personal perfection, or the hypostatical Union, as far as we can conceive: And if indeed God imputed to him the sins of all the elect, so as first to make the very sins themselves to become Christs own sins by imputation, then Christ suffered for his own sins, and must be more odious to God than any ordinary sinner; and all good men that knew it

it by him must have judged accordingly: For sin, & especially the sins of so many millions & so great, must needs render him whose own they are, really sinful, hateful and miserable. Any of which to say of Christ is blasphemy.

Christ undertook that guilt of our sin which is nothing but the obligation to punishment, and that such punishment as beseemed him to undergo. There is a *guilt* of *Fact*, and a guilt of *crime*, and a guilt of *punishment*. Christ undertook the last, but neither of the former as in themselves considered, unless as by connotation relatively he may be said to be guilty of the sin meerly because he undertook to suffer for it; which is improper speech. Christ condescended to the admiration of Angels in taking on him our nature, and our punishment, and suffering for our sins; but his holiness would not suffer him to undertake our sin it self, or take it to be his own sin: Nay considering the communication of attributes which Divines assert from the hypostatical Union, men should tremble to think of laying a ground of calling it *The Sin of God*, by the same reason as, *Acts* 20. it's said, [*The blood of God.*] Its a sad case that partiality can so much prevail, as that they that cry out of some doubtful words as damnable heresies, do yet think it tolerable language to say, that by Imputation of the very sin itself to Christ as his sin, he was the greatest sinner, the greatest Murderer, Lyer, Adulterer, *&c.* in the world. I beseech you abstain from such words till you find them in the Scripture. Christ never was reputed of God a sinner, who did so much to shew his hatred of it. Nor ever took our sin unto him, any further than to suffer for it to expiate it: And if this be the similitude by which we must understand how his *Holiness* and *Righteousness*

is made ours, it will make all very plain. It is ours, or imputed to us, so far as to be reputed the true cause of our Justification, Adoption, Sanctification and Glory, as our sin was the cause of his suffering and death.

Cont. 12. *Doth not Christs righteousness cause our Sanctification in the same sort of causality as it causeth our Justification?*

Anſ. The effects are divers, but both from the same meritorious cause. But it is more unapt to say that it is the material cause of our Sanctification than that it is the material cause of our righteousness; Though it merit both; Because our habitual and actual holiness hath a nearer material cause in itself which our pardon and meer adoption have not.

Cont. 13. *When it is said that faith is imputed to us for righteousness is it faith indeed that is meant or Christs Righteousness believed on?*

Anſ. A strange and bold question. What occasion hath the Holy Ghost given us to raise such a suspicion, that when it is so often said by him that *Faith* is *imputed* or *accounted* for *righteousness*, men should make a doubt whether it be Faith indeed that he meaneth? If it be not, the context is so far from relieving our understandings, that it contributeth to our unavoidable deceit or ignorance. Read over the Texts and put but [*Christs Righteousness*] every where instead of the word [*Faith*;] and see what a scandalous Paraphrase you will make. The Scripture is not so audaciously to be Corrected: It's wiser to believe Gods Word than to contradict it on pretence of expounding it.

Obj. *But it is said also that Righteousness is imputed: And that must be either Christs Righteous-*

ness

nesſ or our own : But not our own; therefore Chriſts.

Anſ. We are not now queſtioning whether *Chriſts Righteouſneſs be imputed to us*: Though it be not the Phraſe of the Scripture, I have ſhewed you that it is true, in a ſound ſence. But the queſtion is, *Whether Faith be imputed for righteouſneſs.* And what is the meaning of all ſuch Texts? To *have righteouſneſs imputed to us*, plainly ſignifieth to be Reckoned, Accounted, Reputed or Judged righteous. And it's ſtrange that it muſt not be our *own righteouſneſs*, that is imputed or reckoned to us as our own: If it were never ſo well proved, that the very Habits and Acts of Chriſt are by Gift or Union made our own in themſelves, and not only as the cauſes of their effects, yet ſtill *our own* they would be, and the righteouſneſs given by them our own, in order of nature before they are imputed, accounted or reckoned to us as our own. Some way that righteouſneſs which is reckoned to *conſtitute* us righteous is ſurely made our own.

Pſal. 106. 30, 31. *Phinehas's* executing Judgment, it is ſaid to be accounted to him for righteouſneſs. And of *Abrahams* Juſtification God *ſaith, Becauſe thou haſt done this*, &c. What man that ever read the Bible can doubt, but that every man that will be ſaved muſt have a perſonal faith, repentance and holineſs, which is called righteouſneſs many hundred times in the Scripture, beſides the righteouſneſs that was or is in Chriſt? And will not God reckon him righteous that is righteous? He that doth righteouſneſs is righteous? And ſhall it not be imputed to him? if God account not a man a believer, can he be juſtified and ſaved? Chriſts Righteouſneſs hath made Satisfaction for all our ſins, and for our unrighteouſneſs as to the Law that doth condemn us: But he made us not lawleſs,

but put us under a Law of Grace, which saith [*He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.*] And must we not be judged by this Law? and be justified or condemned as we keep or break it? wonderful is the power of prejudice that any good men that read the Scripture can doubt whether Christ himself hath made us a Law of Grace, according to which as performers or non-performers we must be justified as righteous in subordination to Christs Righteousness or else be condemned, as neglecters of so great Salvation? Is any thing plainer in all the Gospel?

Obj. *But it is the Object, and not the Act; Christs Righteousness and not our Faith; the Gold and not the Hand that taketh it, that is our Riches and Righteousness.*

Ans. 1. No question but the Faith that we talk of, is *Faith in Christ*, even the Believing *Receiving* of a *Saviour* and his *Grace* freely *given us*. And therefore Christs Righteousness is ever connoted when we talk of Faith: For what is the very Specification of the Act but the Object? But it is not the *essence* of Christ or his Righteousness, that constituteth Faith; but Christ *in esse cognito & objectivo*, even as it is not the essence of *Sin* that constituteth *Repentance*, but the *notion* of Sin *in esse cognito* as an Object. And there is no doubt but Christ is the Souls Riches which Faith receiveth. But if the King by Law should restore all the Rebels in *Ireland* to their Estates, and give them their Lives, that lay down Arms, and ask Mercy and accept it, if it come to the Tryal whether they are *Accepters* or *Refusers*, their *Acceptance* must be so far their justifying Righteousness, though their Lives and Estates be their Treasure,

and

and the Kings Act be their Title to it.

Faith is reckoned or imputed to be that which by the Redeemer himself is required of the Sinner to make him partaker of Christ and his Benefits, Reconciliation and Salvation; and it is no other Righteousness.

Christs Righteousness is not imputed to us instead of our *Faith* and Repentance and sincere holiness, which is made by himself the condition of Life. As he died not for the Sins which we were never guilty of, and are no sins, so his Righteousness is not instead of that Righteousness which by his Grace *we have*, but instead of that which we *have not:* Not instead of our being *penitent Believers* and *sanctified before we die*, but instead of that perfect innocency which we want: Not that we are reputed *perfect innocent obeyers*, because he was such; but that our want of it shall not hinder our Justification or Adoption, Grace or Glory. Christ hath done all his part, but he hath appointed us a necessary part which must be done by our selves; and though without him we can do nothing, yet by him we must believe and be new Creatures, and by him that strengtheneth us we can do something; and must work out our Salvation, while he worketh in us to will and to do.

The purchase then and Donation is by Christ, but the *voluntary acceptance* is by us, by the operation of his Grace; which is not to make up any deficiency in Christs part, or to be a supplement to his Righteousness, nor to bear any part of the same office in our Justification; but it's that which subordinately is required of us as the Condition of Pardon and Life, by his own Law or Covenant of Grace. And so far it is imputed to us for Righteousness.

Contr. 14. *Whether Grace be Grace, or Free, if it have any Condition?*

Anſ. As free and great as God will have it, but not ſuch as the wicked man would have it, who would be ſaved from pain, but not from Sin, or without any Condition required of him. The Covenant is made conditional, for the uſe that the commands are made; to bring man to his Duty, and to convey the Benefit in a ſapiential congruous way; but not as requiring a price for the Benefits: He that pardoneth a Traytor on condition that he thankfully accept it, and will not ſpit in the Princes face, and rebel again, doth pardon freely without a price. And as our Duty and Act denieth not that it's Grace by which we do it; ſo the neceſſity of Grace thereto denieth it not to be our *Duty* or our *Act* when we believe. The Covenant giveth ſome Mercies abſolutely, but not all. He that would be from under all Conditions of Gods Promiſes, would be from under all Law, and all threatnings: For what kind of Law is that which hath no Conditions of Reward and Puniſhment.

Obj. *But when the Condition it ſelf is promiſed, it is equal to abſolute.*

Anſ. 1. If that be true, ſtill it is conditional. Why do you not ſay ſo then, not that it hath no Conditions, but that it is a conditional Promiſe equal to an abſolute? 2. But ſtay a little: Is the condition promiſed to all that the conditional promiſe is made to? even to all that hear the Goſpel, or that are baptized. If you ſay that the conditional Promiſe is made to none but the Elect, you deny the Goſpel, which is to be preached to all the World. 3. Will you caſt out Baptiſm by this Argument? and ſo viſible Chriſtianity? Or

will

will you new mold it into an absolute Form? Or will you say that it is no Covenant? If you suppose not God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost to be there given to us with pardon and right to Life upon condition of our believing acceptance, and that we there profess that acceptance which is the Condition, you suppose not that it is Baptism indeed. And when your little notions shall lead you to deny Gods Law and Covenant Gospel, Baptism, and so Christianity as visible, they are scarce fit notions to make you pass for Orthodox, and to be turned against others as erroneous.

4. But how is it that God promiseth the Condition it self? and to whom? I find, *Prov.* 1.23. *Turn you at my reproof; behold I will pour out my Spirit to you; I will make known my Words unto you?* Is it [*if you do first turn.*] Then there is some degree of turning necessary as a condition to the promised special gift of the Spirit? Or is it [*that you may turn?*] Then God promiseth his Spirit and Word to help even those to *turn*, that yet turn not; which must suppose some Condition of consent or non-resistance required which they could perform. I find, that it's all mens duty to pray, and I read [*Ask and ye shall have, seek and ye shall find*, &c.] And so that to ask and seek saving Faith, is a Duty to him that hath but common Faith. And God commandeth no man to ask or seek in vain: A meer command to use means implieth that they are not vain. God then giveth (as Dr. *Twisse* oft saith as out of *Augustine*) the *posse credere* where yet the act of Faith doth not follow: and it is not a meer Passive, but an Active Power. And where he giveth Grace which causeth the Act it self, did God Promise, it before hand to that man any more than to others?

He

He promiseth Christ to call all his Elect: But this giveth no right to any individual Person before he is born, or before he believeth: Therefore not to the first Faith. For God to tell men, what he will do with his Elect is one thing; and to enter into Covenant with a man, and give a right thereby is another. This Covenant hath it's Conditions.

Contr. 15. *Here comes in also the Controversie whether Repentance be any Condition of Pardon, or Justification? And whether to affirm it be not to equal it with Faith?*

Anſ. Read these Texts of Scripture and judge, *Ezek.* 14. 6. & 18. 30. *Luk.* 13. 3, 5. *Act.* 2. 38. & 8. 22. & 17. 30, 31. & 26. 18, 20. *Mar.* 1. 4. *Lu.* 24. 47. *Act.* 5. 31. & 11. 18. & 13. 24. & 20. 21. *Luk.* 15. 7. &c.

2. *Faith* in *Christ* as it is the remedying Grace ever supposeth *Faith in God* as God, and *Repentance towards God*, Act. 20. 21 as it's end, and is connoted when it is not expreſt. He that saith, [*Take me and trust me as your Physician and I will cure you*] implieth, 1. If you desire to be cured. 2. If you will take my Medicines. To believe in Christ, is to trust that through his Mediation a penitent returning Sinner shall be pardoned and accepted of God and saved. Holiness is the Souls health, and Christ believed in is the remedy: Repentance and Holiness are necessary as the end for themselves, and Faith in the Mediator is necessary as the use of the Remedy. The Office or Nature of these is not the same, though both be Conditions. Yet as Repentance is the change of the Mind, so repenting of unbelief is Faith it self, denominated with respect to the *terminus à quo*. Unhappy

happy wits set things as opposite, which God hath connexed and made coordinate.

Contr. 16. *Whether Faith justifie us as a meritorious Cause, or as a dispositive Cause of receiving Justification, or as a meer Condition, or as an Instrumental Cause?*

Ans. If these Logical names had never been used, plain Christians would have understood what is necessary without them.

1. That the Promise maketh Faith a *Condition*, making unbelief a stop to the benefit, and Faith the removal of that stop, is past all doubt. And the *Promise* being the *Donative Instrument*, and its *Condition* being its *Mode*, the interest of a *Condition* is most certainly the *formal Law-interest* that Faith hath as to our Justification.

2. And Dr. *Twisse*'s forementioned name of *Causa dispositiva, i. e. recipiendi*, is undoubtedly also apt, and signifieth both the *Nature of the Act*, and the *Office of it as a Condition:* For in both respects it is the *necessary qualification* of the *Patient* or *Receiver*, *i. e. naturally and legally necessary*; such as *dispositio materiæ* is said to be in Physicks.

3. And as for the notion of an *Instrumental Cause* of Justification, it is past doubt that properly taken neither Faith, nor any act of ours is any such, nor doth justifie us efficiently at all: But if any be so fond of the invented notion of an *Instrument*, as that they will use it, though unaptly, they must say, 1. That it is not an Efficient, but a Recipient Instrument. Dr. *Kendall* calls it like Boys catching the Ball in their Hats, or as a Spoon is in eating: But it is not an Instrument of *Physical Reception*, but *Moral*. To *Trust* is no more a *Reception*, than to *Love*. The active *Acceptance of a Saviour given with*

with his benefits, is a Moral Receiving of him, which *disposeth us* as the Condition of the Covenant to receive Justification, that is, to *be justified.* And in this lax sense, you may call it all these if you please; *viz.* a *Condition,* a *Dispositive Cause,* and a *Receiving Instrument.*

4. A Meritorious Cause it is not in a Commutative or strict sense. But if you will call that meritorious which is *pleasing to God as congruous to his free gift and design of grace,* whence some are called *Worthy* in the Gospel, so the thing is not to be denied; and so all are reconciled.

Contr. 17. *Is justifying Faith an act of the understanding or will?*

Ans. Both, and therefore it is no one Physical act only, nor Instrumental in a strict Physical sense.

Contr. 18. *What act of Faith is it that justifieth as to the Object? whether only the belief of the truth of the Promise, or of the whole Gospel also, or the affiance on Christs Righteousness, or on his Truth, or on his Intercession, or taking him wholly for our Saviour, Prophet, Priest and King? And whether Faith in God the Father, and the Holy Ghost, do justifie? or all these? And if but one, which is it? and whether all the rest are the works which* Paul *excludeth from Justification?*

Ans. To say that only one Physical act of Faith is it that we are justified by, and all the rest are those *works,* is a perverse corrupting of Christianity, and not to be heard without detestation. For it will utterly confound all persons, to find out which that one act is, which they indeed can never do. And it will contradict the substance of all the Gospel: There is no such thing as Faith in Christ,

Christ, which containeth not, or includeth not *Faith in God as God*, both as he is our Creator, and as reconciled by Christ, and as the Giver of Christ to us, *John* 3. 16. and as the end of all the work of Redemption. Nor is there any such thing as Faith in Christ which is true and saving, that includeth not, or connoteth not the Knowledge of Christ, and Love, and Desire, and Thankfulness, and Consent: Nor did ever God tell us of a Faith in Christs Imputed Righteousness only that must justifie us, which is not also a Faith in his Person, Doctrine, Law, Promise and Example; and his Intercession in the Heavens. And to say that only the Act of Recumbency on Christs Righteousness as imputed to our Justification, is that act of Faith by which we are justified, and that Believing in God, his Majesty, Truth, Wisdom, Goodness, and the believing in Christ as he is the Prophet, Teacher, King of the Church, and the Resurrection, Life, and Judge of all; and believing in the Holy Ghost, as the Sanctifier, Comforter, and Witness and Advocate of Christ, and believing and trusting the Promise of God for Life Eternal, or for any grace except *Christs Righteousness imputed*, that all this Faith in God, in Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, and all our Love to Christ, and desire after him, and prayer for his grace, and thankfulness for it, *&c.* are all none of the Faith which Justification is promised to, but are the *Works* by which no man is *justified*, and that he is faln from grace, that seeketh to be justified by such works, that is, by true *Faith* in God as God, and in Christ as Christ: This is a new Gospel subverting Christs Gospel, and making Christianity another thing; and this without any countenance from the Scripture, and contrary to its very scope.

The

The Faith by which we are justified, is one Moral act containing many Physical acts, even our fiducial Consent to the Baptismal Covenant, and dedication of our selves to God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, to be our Reconciled God, our Saviour, and our Sanctifier, to give us Pardon, Adoption, Holiness and Glory, which is *our Christianity it self as such.*

Contr. 18. *But though this be the Faith* quæ justificat, *which justifieth us, is it not only Recumbency on Christs Imputed Righteousness,* quâ talis, *which hath the Office of Instrumentality, and is* fides quâ justificans.

Ans. Such quibbling and jingling of a meer sound of words is usual in ludicrous Disputations of Lads: But it's pity it should pass as the last remedy against plain truth in so great a matter. First it must be remembred that no Faith justifieth efficiently, and therefore neither *quæ* nor *quâ justificans* is to signifie any such thing, but a meer Moral qualification of the recipient subject; so that to be justified by *Faith*, is but to be justified by it as that which God hath promised Justification on as the qualifying Condition: But if it be not the *same thing* that is here called *Fides quæ* and *quâ*, but in the first part they speak of the *Habit*, and in the second of the *Act*, had it not been plainer to say, [*The same Habit of Faith hath several Acts, as believing in God, in Christs Intercession, Kingdom,* &c. *but none of these Acts do justifie us, but one only*; viz. *trusting to the Imputation of his Righteousness?*] And so both the *quæ* and *quâ* is [denied to all Acts save that one. This is their plain meaning, which is denied to be truth, and is a human dangerous invention. Yet it's granted them, that it is not every

Act

Act of Faith that is made the Condition of Justification or Salvation: It is necessary that the formal Object, *Gods Veracity*, be believed to make it true Faith; and that the Gospel or Covenant of Grace be believed with Consent, as aforesaid, to make it to be the true Christian Faith, in essence; and it's of necessity that every thing be believed which we know that God revealeth. But it is the *Christian Faith* that hath the Promise of Justification, and that not any one single Act of it, but all that is essential to it, and that which belongeth but to its Integrity *ad bene esse*, when it existeth, is also so far conducible to our Justification, (as *Abrahams* believing that *Isaac* should live and have seed, when he went to sacrifice him) yet Justification may be without some Acts, as Salvation may without many due Acts of Obedience, when yet *sincerity* of Obedience is necessary, and those Acts, if done, have their place with the rest as means of Salvation; so here: But Saving Faith is denominated from the essential part: The *nature of Faith* is in order of nature antecedent to its Office: The nature of it *in genere* is to believe all that God saith: The nature of it *in specie* is to believe in Christ, and consent to his Covenant: The *integrity* of it is to believe all that we find revealed. The Office of it as the *Means* of Justification, is to be the condition of the Justifying Covenant or Law. That which some call the Instrumentality, is the very nature of the Act, the *τὸ credere in specie*: *Believing in Christ* is the *τὸ credere*, and that's it that they call an *Instrument* of receiving him as such. But the *τὸ credere* even *in specie*, Faith in Christ, doth not justifie *quâ talis*, as that Faith, but as it is that qualifying Condition which the Promise annexeth Justification to; without which it would

would not have done it. Had the Promise been absolute, it had pardoned us before, and without Faith. The nature of the Act is like the metal of Gold or Silver, and the tenor of the Justifying Covenant is as the Kings Stamp, that maketh it currant Coin. It is Faith in order of nature before it is the Justifying Condition.

The *quâ justificans* therefore should speak, not a distinct Act from the other Acts of the Christian Faith as such, but the relation of the same Acts to the benefit. *Omnis fidei actus qui justificat, considerari potest quatenus justificat.*

Contr. 19. *Whether we are justified by the Law of Innocency saying, Obey perfectly and live?*

Ans. This is one of the chief points of all our difference: Some say, that because Christ fulfilled it for us, we are justified by that Law as fulfillers of it: This is it that Mr. *Anthony Wotton* hath bestowed most of his Learned Treatise *de Reconciliatione* to confute. The Law justified Christ, but not us, for it never said, *Thou, or another for thee shalt obey.*] Nor doth it know a *Vicarius obedientiæ aut pœnæ*; nor take Christs Person and ours for the same: Therefore we are not justified by that Law, but condemned by it: And it cannot condemn and justifie the same man. But we are justified by another Law, Covenant or Promise by Christs fulfilling the Law of Innocency, and making over to us the benefits.

Contr. 20. *Whether by Works be meant Acts in general, or only such Acts as are adverse to Faith in Christ, and make the reward to be of debt, and not of grace?*

Ans.

Anſ. The laſt is the Apoſtles Expoſition of them. Chriſt ſaith, we are juſtified by our words; *James*, by our works; and all the Scripture that ſpeaketh of Juſtification, aſcribeth it to ſome Acts: It is [*according to our works*:] And Faith is an Act, yea many Acts.

Obj. *But it juſtifieth not as an Act, but as an Inſtrument.*

Anſ. That is, not as an Act or good Act *in genere*, but as *this Act in ſpecie*; *viz. Believing on Chriſts Righteouſneſs*: But that is the τὸ *credere*; that is, *As this Act*: But it is not ſo, unleſs you add [*As it is this congruous Act, or Acts authorized by Gods Covenant to this Office.*] So we will grant, that no Act juſtifieth as an *Act*, or as a *good Act*; but as a *congruous good Act appointed thereto.*

As is ſaid before, To believe in God, and in Chriſt as Chriſt, and in the Promiſe of Salvation, and to believe the evil of ſin, and the need of a Saviour, and to deſire him, and be thankful for him, and pray for pardon, are not the works that *Paul* ſpeaketh againſt, but ſome belong to the Eſſence, and ſome to the Integrity and Accidents of that Faith by which we are juſtified. Yet a fooliſh perſon may contradict himſelf, and hold his own *Faith*, as well as his Love, or Deſire, or Prayer, to be meritorious, as making the reward not of grace: Such mad contradiction may ſuppoſe Faith to be the works which it denieth.

Cont. 21. *Are any works of man meritorious?*

Anſ. Not in point of Commutative Juſtice, that giveth one thing for another to the commodity of each; as in buying and ſelling.

2. Nor yet in diſtributive Governing Juſtice as making any good due to us by the Law of Innocency or Works.

3. But as God hath freely given us Christ and Life by a Law of *Grace*, on condition of suitable acceptance and use so he that performeth this condition, is called *worthy*, and the contrary *unworthy* in the Gospel; and did not men abuse it, they might with all the ancient Churches use the word *merit* in the same sense as *worthiness*. As a good natured Child that humbly and thankfully taketh money or meat when his Father giveth it him, is said to *deserve* it of him, better than he that scorneth it and him. So our merit is but of paternal Governing Justice in the Kingdom of Love, according to Gods Law of Grace in Christ.

Cont. 22. *Whether obedience be a part of Faith, or we are justified by obedience.*

Anſ. 1. To believe in Christ at first is an act of obedience to God, who commandeth us so to do: But it is but *Subjection* to Christ which that act includeth, that is, taking him for our Lord and Saviour to be obeyed, which is virtually all future obedience as its root, but not actually.

2. Actual obedience to Christ is not faith, but the fruit of faith, and part of our performance of the Covenant which we made with him, and necessary to the continuance of our Justification and to our Salvation, as all the Scripture fully sheweth.

Cont. 23. *Whether any more be necessary to the continuance or not losing our Justification, than to the beginning of it.*

Anſ. Yes, 1. More acts of the same faith. 2. Praying for pardon. 3. Forgiving others, as Christ expresly tells us. 4. Sincere Love and Obedience to Christ unto the end.

Cont.

Cont. 24. *Is Pardon and Justification perfect the first moment?*

Ans. No. 1. All the punishment is not yet taken off: We have yet much penal want of Grace, and the Spirits Operations, and Communion with God. 2. We have not right to the present removal of all the punishment. 3. Many more sins hereafter must be pardoned. 4. Much means is yet to be used for final Justification. 5. That final Justification only is perfect.

Cont. 25. *Is nolle punire or non punire a pardoning of sin?* It's Dr. *Twisses* Controversy.

Ans. Yes, In some degree, to a capable person that is, to a sinner; But not to one that is no sinner, or before one hath a being.

Cont. 26. *Is future sin pardoned before hand.*

Ans. Future sin is not sin, and therefore not capable of pardon, nor the person for it: But it may be pardoned virtually, though not actually: A general grant of pardon may be given, which is conditional and virtual, and shall actually pardon it when it is.

Cont. 27. *Is any one punished for sin that is pardoned?*

Ans. Not in the same thing and degree that he is pardoned: But every man that is pardoned in this life, is yet correctively punished in that degree that he is unpardoned. For pardon is yet imperfect here.

Cont. 28. *Is it not unjust to punish him that Christ died for, even one sin twice?*

Anſ. No, Unleſs it were the ſame perſon that ſuffered, or the very ſame puniſhment that was due (and all that was due) were expected again; and unleſs it were againſt our mediators will. But all is contrary in this caſe. 1. The Law bound no one to ſuffer but the offender. 2. Therefore Chriſts ſuffering was not the ſame puniſhment which the Law did threaten, but it was *Satisfaction* inſtead of it; which is the *Tantundem*, not the *idem quod debitum fuit*, but *redditio æquivalentis aliàs indebiti*, as the Schoolmen call it. For *noxa caput ſequitur*; the Law threateneth not a ſurety, but only the *ſinner*, and *ubi alius ſolvit, ſimul aliud ſolvitur.* 3. And Chriſt himſelf never ſatisfied with any other intent; and therefore it is according to his will, that they that tread under foot the blood of the Covenant wherewith they were Sanctified, as an unholy thing, and do deſpight to the Spirit of Grace, ſhould ſuffer the far ſorer puniſhment, *Heb.* 10. Yea it is Chriſt himſelf that will have it ſo, and that doth ſo judge, them, and inflict this puniſhment for the contempt of grace.

And it is his will that his own members be puniſhed by correction, notwithſtanding his ſufferings: As many as he loveth he doth rebuke and chaſten: And Chriſt doth not wrong himſelf: The end of his ſuffering never was to excuſe the redeemed from all ſuffering, nor to make believers lawleſs.

Cont. 29. *Is a man after his regeneration and Faith, ever obliged to any but temporal puniſhments, or need to ask pardon of any other?*

Anſ. Obliged is a word that needeth explication: The very Law of nature yet in force maketh everlaſting puniſhment due to a believers ſins, till God forgive them: But they are forgiven, (and the

the obligation dissolved) through Christ by the Covenant of Grace to a *true believer* as soon as committed (at least if they be meer sins of infirmity) because of his general repentance and continued faith: But yet in order of nature the Guilt and dueness of punishment is before the remission of them. And believers must ask pardon while they live. 1. Because every sin thus needeth it; and asking is part of the expression of that faith and repentance which is our condition of pardon. 2. They must ask the continuance of that pardon which they have. 3. And they must ask still for *executive* remission; which is, *not to punish, pœna damni vel sensus*; Body or Soul, and so for more of Gods forfeited Grace and Spirit, and the sense of his Love, and Communion with him.

Cont. 30. *What is it to be judged according to our works, or what we have done in the body?*

Ans. To be *Judged* is the *genus*: To be *Justified* or *Condemned* are the *Species*. This openeth all the Controversy. It is not *according to our works as they* are congruous to the Law of *Innocency* or *works*; But as judged by the *Law of Grace*; Therefore it is not the *same works* which *Paul* excluded from Justification, for we shall not be judged according to them. 2. And *according to them*, is as much as *James* meaneth, when he saith, *we are justified by them*: It's all one, that is, the Law of Christ our Redeemer requireth sincere obedience of all that shall be saved, by his blood and merits from the condemnation of the Law of Innocency; and accordingly mens right to Christ & Salvation shall be judged of: Their right to life through Christs merits and free gift, shall be justified who were sincerely penitent believing obeyers to the end, and no others.

Cont. 31. *What Law is it that* Paul *calleth the law of works, and laboriously proveth that its works do not justify us.*

Anſ. It is the Moſaical Jewiſh Law, as is all along evident; and not the Law of Innocency, as made to *Adam*; though conſequently *à fortiore*, it's certain that we have no works by which that will juſtify us (either perſonal or imputed.) The words [*He that doth them ſhall live in them*] do not mean, *He that is no ſinner*, according to the Law of perfection: For 1. All men were ſinners before, and ſo this Law ſhould have been only a condemnation in the form of a promiſe. 2. And this Law preſcribeth Sacrifices and Prayers for pardon of ſin; which the firſt Law of Innocency knew not.

Cont. 32. *How and why then is this called a Law of works? Which juſtify no man?*

Anſ. Becauſe it impoſeth ſtrictneſs in a multitude of laborious Tasks and Ceremonies, and rigorouſly puniſheth the breakers of it. 2. The heretical teachers had falſly ſeparated the Law from the promiſe of Chriſts juſtifying righteouſneſs and grace, which was the ſence and end of the Law: And *Paul* proveth that without the *Promiſe* and *Chriſt*, the Law is but a carkaſs of fruitleſs works without a Soul, and cannot juſtify. 3. But yet a believing Jew being juſtified by faith in the promiſed ſeed, was to obey *Moſes* Law ſincerely as his material obedience to God his Redeemer; as we are now to obſerve the Sacraments inſtituted by Chriſt as part of our ſincere obedience, neceſſary to Salvation.

Cont.

Cont. 33. *What is* Pauls *drift in all his disputes about Justification?*

Anſ. 1. Primarily, to prove the neceſſity of a SaviourSacrifice,Righteouſneſs and Interceſſion to ſave and juſtify us, and that the doing of *Moſes* Law, how excellent ſoever eſteemed by the Jews, would not juſtify without him. 2. To prove that the Gentiles may be ſaved by faith without the Law, as well as the Jews by Faith with it: And that it bindeth not the Gentiles, and is abrogate to the Jews, and that the Law of Chriſt ſucceedeth it. He confuteth their truſting to the keeping of their Law inſtead of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, and the promiſe of Grace and their obtruding their Law upon the Gentiles as neceſſary to Salvation.

Cont. 34. *What is the drift of St.* James?

Anſ. That bare believing the Goſpel to be true, will not ſerve to any mans Salvation without obeying Chriſts Commands; Nor will juſtify any mans Title to Salvation, or prove him acceptable to God. It is the ſame Juſtification before God (and not only in conſcience or before men (that *Paul* and *James* ſpeak of, and the ſame inſtance of *Abraham* they bring, but by [*Works*] they mean not the ſame thing, as is before explained.

Cont. 35. *Muſt a believer truſt at all to his faith, repentance, or holineſs, or plead it any way to his Juſtification?*

Anſ. It muſt be truſted or pleaded inſtead of nothing that is Chriſts part, nor for any thing but its own part. But a part it hath, as is confeſſed, and for that part it muſt be truſted and pleaded; and

no man must trust to be saved without faith repentance and obedience, *Heb.* 12. 14. *Mar.* 16. 16. *Luk.* 13. 3, 5. I conclude all in Dr. *Prestons* words, Treatise of Faith. *p.* 44, 45. And of the Attributes, *p.* 71. [" *Justifying Faith* (defined) *is a Grace or* " *habit infused into the Soul whereby we are enabled to* " *believe, not only that the* Messiah *is offered to us,* " *but also to take and receive him as a Lord and* " *Saviour that is, both to be saved by him and obey* " *him.*

" *No man believeth* Justification by Christ but his " faith is mainly grounded on this Word of God: " In Scripture we find that Jesus Christ is come in " the flesh, and that he is the Lamb slain for the for- " giveness of sins: That he is offered to every crea- " ture: That a man must thirst after him, and then " take up his Cross and follow him: Now come " to a believer going out of the World, and ask " him, what hope he hath to be saved, he will be " ready to say, I know that Christ is come into the " World, and offered up, and I know that I am one " of them that have a part in him: I know that I " have fulfilled the conditions, as that I should not " continue willingly in any known sin, that I should " love the Lord Jesus, & desire to serve him above " all: I know that I have fulfilled these conditions, " and for all this I have the word for my ground, *&c.* " So far Dr. *Preston.*

Cont. 36. *Hath Justification and Salvation the same conditions, and do works save us, which do not justifie us.*

Ans. 1. The works which *Paul* excludeth from Justification he excludeth from saving us, *Eph.* 2. 5. 8, 9. *Tit.* 3. 5. so *Jam.* 2. 14, &c. 2. Justification begun and our right given to Salvation have the same

ſame condition. 3. Juſtification in the laſt Judgment, is the juſtifying of our right to Glory, and hath the ſame condition with our glorification, *Mat.* 25. *Come ye bleſſed*, &c. But more is neceſſary to final Juſtification and Salvation, than to our firſt right, as is before ſhewed.

Cont. 37. *Is there any ſuch thing as a Juſtifying us againſt Satans falſe accuſations: As that a believer is no believer, impenitent, an hypocrite*, &c. Some ſay the Devil will not be ſo fooliſh, knowing that God knoweth all.

Anſ. If Juſtification relate not to Accuſation, Divines have hitherto much wronged the Church in maintaining it ſo commonly as they have done. If it do, 1. It is either to a *true* or a *falſe* accuſation. Againſt a *true accuſation* no man can be juſtified, but muſt confeſs the charge. If it be ſaid that we *ſinned*, and that this *ſin deſerved death*, it muſt be confeſſed, and we cannot be juſtified directly againſt this charge: For *Guilt* and *Righteouſneſs* cannot conſiſt as to the ſame particular cauſe. But if it be ſaid. 1. That we are unbelievers, impenitent, hypocrites, *&c.* 2. Or that we have no part in Chriſt, 3. Or that we are not pardoned, accepted, reconciled and adopted for his meritorious righteouſneſs and interceſſion, and were not thus conſtituted juſt; 4. And that therefore we have no right to life, but ought to be condemned: All theſe are falſe accuſations againſt which we may and muſt be juſtified.

2. And Satan is a Lyar and a Murderer and the accuſer of the brethren: And his knowledge hindred not his malice from falſly accuſing *Job* to God himſelf, nor from tempting Chriſt himſelf to the moſt odious ſin.

3. But

3. But it sufficeth us that Justification relateth not only to *Actual Accusation*, but to *Virtual*, yea to *Possible*: And if God declare the Righteousness of his Servants by his Light, Sentence or Execution, though none accuse them, either Satan or Conscience, it still relateth to *possible* Accusation.

They that deny all this, must needs say that at Judgment (and before as to any Sentence) there will be no Justification at all, because no Accusation true or false: And if no Justification (nor Condemnation) then no Judgment, which is all contrary to an Article of Faith.

Contr. 38. *But though all this prove that we are justified by Faith, yet not as a Righteousness; so that it is questioned whether any personal Righteousness consisting in our performance of the Condition of the Covenant, be that which we are justified by here or at last, in subordination to Christs Righteousness* [which needs no supplement from us?]

Ans. 1. This Question is either of the *Thing*, or of the bare *Name* of *Righteousness* (whether it should so be called.)

1. As to the *Thing*, it is fully proved already, that Faith, Repentance and Obedience are of flat necessity to our Salvation; and therefore to the *Justifying* of our *Claim* of *Right* to that Salvation: And therefore to Justifie the *Person* as to that *Right* and *Claim* (that he is one that truly hath such right:) For the *Person* is justified by the justifying of his *Cause*: I suppose none of this will be denied.

2. And as to the *Name*, 1. The definition will prove it apt: That which is *Righteous*, denominateth the subject accordingly. Every Cause in Judgment is Righteous or Unrighteous: And the Person is Righteous so far as his *Cause* is so: If it be

be ſaid againſt a Believer, that [*he hath no right to Chriſt, and Glory*] his *Right* is his *Righteouſneſs* as againſt this Charge: This Right is no natural being at all, but a *Moral Relation*, called *Dueneſs*. Yet this is his *Juſtifying Righteouſneſs*. But the *fundamentum* of that Right is *quid abſolutum*.

It is an abſurd contradiction to ſay that a man hath any *Righteouſneſs* that doth not ſo far *conſtitute him righteous*; as it is to ſay that a man hath Learning, Wit, Honeſty, Goodneſs, which do not ſo far make him Learned, Wiſe, Honeſt or Good: Or the Paper hath whiteneſs that maketh it not white.

3. But we ever diſtinguiſh between *Total Righteouſneſs* and *Partial*, *in tantum* or *ſecundum quid*: And between that Righteouſneſs *in tantum* which *Salvation is laid on*, and that which is of *ſmall concern*: And alſo between *Chriſts part and mans*. And ſo we ſtill ſay, 1. That *Chriſts part* needeth no ſupplement from ours; nor do we perform the leaſt that belongs to him. 2. But his own Law, Will and Covenant, hath laid a *neceſſary part on us*. 3. That by this we are no further juſtified than *in tantum*, as it is a Righteouſneſs of ours; that is, *Faith* in it ſelf, as ſuch, juſtifieth us only againſt the falſe Charge of Infidelity; Repentance only againſt the falſe Charge of Impenitency; Holineſs and Sincerity againſt the falſe Charge of unholineſs and hypocriſie, *&c.* But, *as the Condition of the Covenant*, they prove *our right to Chriſt and Life*: And ſo as the *Donation* in the Goſpel is the *Titulus ſeu fundamentum juris*; ſo *Faith and Repentance* are the *Conditio tituli*.

There is a *Partial Righteouſneſs* which every wicked man may have, which entitleth no one to Salvation. The Devil himſelf may be falſly accuſed, and be juſtifiable againſt that accuſation:

But

But the tenor of Gods Covenant maketh this in queſtion to be a *Righteouſneſs on which Salvation lieth.*

Yet we ſay that nothing of ours, or in us, is a Righteouſneſs that would do any thing to our Salvation, without the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt.

Obj. *This is like the Papiſts, who ſay, That Chriſt merited to make our actions meritorious*: So you ſay, *That Chriſts Righteouſneſs purchaſed a perſonal Evangelical Righteouſneſs for us, by which we are juſtified.*

Anſ. Yes: by which we are juſtified, 1. Againſt the Charge of *Infidelity*, *Impenitency*, and *Inſincerity*, and *final Ungodlineſs*: And 2. By which *our title to Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs*, and *purchaſed benefits* muſt be juſtified, as by the *Condition* of the free gift. And to deny this, is to deny or ſubvert the whole Goſpel. As to the talk of *Popiſh Merits*, I will not be ſo vain as to divert on that occaſion. He is no true Chriſtian that really denieth that Chriſts Righteouſneſs hath procured a perſonal Righteouſneſs in and of us, conſiſting in our conformity to the Conditional Mode of the Promiſe of Chriſt and Life. We may differ in *words*, while we mean the *ſame thing*: But as for him that denieth *the thing*, I know that he can be no better than prophane.

Righteouſneſs is denominated as related, 1. To *the Precept and Condition of the Law of Innocency*: ſo the erroneous ſay, *We are ſo righteous by Chriſts Righteouſneſs imputed*: And the orthodox ſay, We have no ſuch Righteouſneſs.

2. As related to the bare Precept of the Law of Chriſt ſince the Fall; which requiring perfection, (that is, making it a *duty*) we have no ſuch Righteouſneſs, and therefore daily ask for pardon.

3. To

3. To the *Tenor or Mode* of *the Promising and penal part of the Law of Christ*; which giveth pardon and Life on Condition of *penitent believing acceptance and consent*; and *continueth* it on Condition also of *sincere obedience to* Christ our Redeemer, and God in him: and so we shall be *judged*, and either *justified* or *damned*, as we have or have not *this personal Righteousness*: Christ in Judgment is not to try his *own part*, but *ours*: He that is not thus justified shall be damned.

And as to the Libertine or Antinomian errour (that this performing of the Condition of the Promise is *no righteousness*, but only *Christs* imputed is *Righteousness*, because it answereth not the perfect Precept, though it answer the *imposed Condition* of the Promise, and that it is not to be called *Righteousness*, nor we so far as is aforesaid to be *justified by it*; I appeal to Scripture and the reason of the thing.

The Words *Just*, *Justice*, *Righteous* and *Righteousness*, *Justifie* and *Justification*, being viewed in the Concordance, and examined will shew you, that God in Scripture many score or hundred times giveth such Names to our *Personal Qualities and Acts*: And what is that man that dare deny this *constant* language of the Scripture? Doth he take Gods Word for his rule; or will he shame himself by saying that in all these God speaketh unfitly, and that he can mend his Language? See but *Gen.* 6. 9. *Prov.* 17. 15, 26. & 20. 7. & 24. 16. *Isa.* 26. 7. *Ezek.* 18. 5, 9. *Mat.* 1. 19. & 13. 49. *Luk.* 2. 25. & 20. 20. & 23. 50. *Act.* 10. 22. *Rom.* 2. 13. *Jam.* 5. 6. 2 *Pet.* 2. 7. *Exo.* 23. 7. *Deu.* 25. 1. *Jer.* 3. 11. *Mat.* 12. 37. *Luk.* 18. 14. 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *Jam.* 2. 21, 24, 25. *Rom.* 3. 26. *Ezek.* 33. 13. &c. *Ezek.* 48. 18. *Psal.* 35. 24. *Eph.* 4. 24.

2 *Cor.*

2 *Cor.* 9. 9. *Mat.* 6. 33. & 5. 20. *Ezek.* 3. 20. 1 *Sam.* 26. 23. 1 *Pet.* 3. 14. *Gal.* 3. 6. *Rom.* 4. 5, 9, 22. *Jam.* 2. 23. *Gal.* 3. 6. *Mat.* 5. 20. *Gen.* 15. 6. *Rev.* 19. 8. 1 *Joh.* 2. 19. & 3. 7, 10. 2 *Pet.* 2. 5, 21. & 3. 13. 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. *Jam.* 3. 18. *Heb.* 1. 9. & 7. 2. & 11. 33. & 12. 11. 2 *Tim.* 2. 22. & 4. 8. 1 *Tim.* 6. 11. *Phil.* 1. 11. *Eph.* 5. 9. & 6. 14. 1 *Cor.* 15. 34. 2 *Cor.* 6. 7, 14. & 9. 10. *Rom.* 6. 13, 16, 18, 19, 20. & 8. 4, 10. & 10. 5, 6, 10. & 14. 17. *Act.* 10. 35. & 13. 10. *Luk.* 1. 75. *Mat.* 5. 6. & 21. 32. *Zeph.* 2. 3. *Dan.* 12. 3. & 4. 27. *Ezek.* 18. 20. & 33. 12. *Isa.* 1. 27. & 5. 23. & 26. 9, 10. & 32. 17. & 64. 5. & 61. 3. *Prov.* 10. 2. & 11. 4, 5, 6, 18, 19. & 12. 28. & 13. 6. & 15. 9. & 21. 21. *Psal.* 106. 3. *Deu.* 6. 25. *Psal.* 11. 7. & 15. 2. & 23. 3. *Mat.* 10. 41. *Rom.* 5. 7. 2 *Pet.* 2. 8. *Jam.* 5. 16. 1 *Tim.* 1. 9. *Rev.* 22. 12. 1 *Pet.* 3. 12. & 4. 18. *Heb.* 11. 4. 2 *Tim.* 4. 8. *Rom.* 2. 5, 6. &c. *Luk.* 1. 6. *Mar.* 2. 17. *Mat.* 25. 37, 46. & 13. 43. *Mal.* 3. 18. *Hab.* 1. 4, 13. *Amos* 2. 6. *Isa.* 3. 10. & 57. 1. & 60. 21. *Eccl.* 8. 14. *Prov.* 24. 24. & 15. 29, 28, 19. 6. & 14. 32. & 12. 26. *Psal.* 146. 8. & 1. 5, 6. & 5. 12. & 32. 11. & 33. 1. & 34. 15, 17, 19, 21. & 58. 11. & 97. 11, 12. *Num.* 23. 10. *Gen.* 18. 23, 24, 25, 26, 28. & 7. 1. *Mat.* 6. 14, 15. & 18. 35. *Mar.* 11. 25, 26. *Luk.* 6. 37. 1 *Joh.* 1. 9. *Mar.* 4. 12. *Act.* 26. 18. *Mar.* 1. 4. & 16. 16. *Lu.* 24. 47. *Act.* 2. 38. & 10. 43. 2 *Cor.* 7. 10. *Heb.* 5. 9 *Rom.* 10. 9, 13. *Act.* 16. 31. & 11. 14, 2, 21. *Mat.* 10. 22. *Prov.* 28. 18. *Eph.* 2. 8. 1 *Cor.* 15. 2. *Rom.* 8. 24. *Jer.* 4. 14. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. *Jam.* 1. 21. & 2. 14. & 5. 20, *Jud.* 23. 1 *Cor.* 1. 21. & 7. 16. 1 *Tim.* 4. 16. *Act.* 2. 40. *Rev.* 22. 14. *Psal.* 37. 40. *Gen.* 22. 16. & 26. 5. 1 *Kin.* 11. 34. *Luk.* 19. 17. *Joh.* 16. 27. *Luk.* 13. 3, 5. *Joh.* 1. 11, 12. & 3. 16, 18, 19. 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. *Heb.* 4. 1. *Rev.* 20. 12, 13.

1 *Pet.*

1 *Pet.* 1. 17. *Eccl.* 12. 14. *Rom.* 14. 10. 2 *Cor.* 5. 10.

I set light by their Judgment, that set light by all these plain Words of God, and can distort them to their humane or self-chosen opinions.

I had thought here to have ended, but since the writing of this, Objectors have raised some new made Controversies.

Qu. 39. *Whether the Acceptation of Christs Righteousnes be the Imputation of it ?*

Anſ. Language is so ambiguous, and some men do so (unskilfully) abuse it to vain Controversie, as if they had been hired to serve the design of our late *Bruitists*, who make *Reason* and *Speech* to be our Misery, proving man more unhappy than the beasts. 1. Either you mean [the *Imputation of it to Christ*,] or [*to us.*] 2. And that either to *faln man* in general, or to *this or that individual* Person in particular.

1. To *Accept* and to *Impute* are not Words of the same sence. But when Christ had performed all that he had undertaken, as the *Condition* of his *Mediatorial Covenant*, or the Law of Mediation imposed on him, it was at once both *accepted* to the ends of that Covenant and his performance, and also *imputed to him*, that is, *He was truly reckoned* to have fulfilled all Righteousnes.

2. *Faln man* was then *reckoned* to be (as to price and merit) *Redeemed*, God *so far pardoning them, or not imputing their sin to them*, as to make them a general Pardon on Condition of a believing due acceptance, & committing to his Ministers the Word of Reconciliation, beseeching them in Christs stead to be personally and actually reconciled to God, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19, 20.

3. Christs

3. Christs Righteousness was *thus accepted* of God as soon as performed: but it was not then as so performed *imputed* to any *singular Person*, to his *personal actual Justification*. For it was *accepted* before we were born, or believed: But it was not so *imputed* to our actual Justification before we were born or believed.

Righteousness is *imputed to us*, if we *believe*, *Rom.* 4. 24. And Faith is *imputed to us for Righteousness*: And he *that believeth not is condemned already*, and *under* the *curse*, when yet Christs Righteousness was accepted long before: If they say that there *is a new Acceptation of it for every Sinner just when he believeth*, *and that it is this that they mean*; I answer, that as long as men take liberty to make new phrases about supernatural mysteries, which are not in Scripture, and to use these to the forming of new Creeds or Articles of Faith, they will be so long in acquainting the World with their meaning, that we shall never come to an end of Controversies, nor to the true understanding of one another: for few such men understand themselves; but when they confound the matter and the readers with their new ambiguous phrases, they cry out against those that would search out their meaning, as if they did but Cavil with their Words, and *distinction* and *understanding* were the way of *Confusion* and not theirs.

We grant that the Justification of every Believer is a *new Effect* of Christs Righteousness: And if they will call this a new *Acceptation by God* of Christs Righteousness, or use any other new made unmeet or gibberish Words, if they will but *expound* them as they go, we shall the better bear them.

Qu. 40. *Whether it follow that Christs sufferings* (or *Passive Obedience*) *did not merit Eternal Life at all for us, because it was only Active Obedience which the Law of Innocency so rewarded* [*Do this and live*] not [*Suffer and live?*]

Anſ. 1. Their foundation-errour animateth the affirmative. They falſly think that it is *that Law of Innocency* which juſtifieth us, which doth *curſe* and *condemn* us, and not juſtifie us at all; but it is the *Goſpel*, or Law of Faith and Grace that juſtifieth us.

2. The *Merit* of *Chriſts Righteouſneſs* is to be reckoned principally as juſtifying us, according to the *tenor of the Law or Covenant* made *only to him as Mediator*: That Covenant laid on Chriſt *ſuch duty* as was made the *Condition of the Promiſe*, and made him a *ſpecial Promiſe* upon that *Condition* or Duty: He performed the *latter* for the *former*. The matter of his undertaken Condition or Duty was threefold. 1. To fulfil the Law of Innocency; 2. And the Law of *Moſes*; 3. And divers Mediatorial acts proper to himſelf; (as to ſatisfie Juſtice by his ſufferings, conquer Satan and Death, work his Miracles, *&c.*) *To perform this whole Condition of his Covenant*, was to *merit* of God-Man Juſtification and Salvation: The *part* of *this* was but *part* of his Merit materially conſidered, *juſtifying himſelf* againſt any charge from that Law which he fulfilled: But his *Mediatorial Acts*, and ſo his *Sufferings* were *another part*, by which he was juſtified, and merited Righteouſneſs and Life for us: And therefore the Objection falſly ſuppoſeth that it is only *Adams Law* that juſtified Chriſt, and according to which he *merited for us*; whereas it was the *Mediatorial Covenant* or Law which made his *Suffering part of the Condition* of the Promiſe made to him for himſelf and us.

His *own Glory* was merited by *death on the Cross*, *Phil.*2.7,8.9. Therefore also *ours*. *By his blood he entered into the Holiest, having obtained eternal Redemption for us.* His *blood* not only *purgeth our Consciences from dead works, to serve the living God*, but *for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the Promise of Eternal Inheritance*, Heb. 12. 14, 15. Heb. 10. 10, 14. *By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. He hath reconciled us in the body of his flesh through death, to present us holy, and unblameable, and unreprovable in his sight*, Col. 1. 22. *To eat Christs flesh, and drink his blood*, is to *believe* his *Sacrifice*, which yet is that which hath the Promise of Life.

Indeed the reason of this Objection would deny also Christs Active Obedience to merit our Salvation: For by the *Law of Innocency* Christ merited for none but himself: For that Law promiseth Life to none but them that *personally* obey, and never mentioned *obeying* by another, nor knows any *Vicarium aut obedientiæ aut pœnæ.* It is only Gods Covenant with the Mediator as such, that gave him right to make us righteous, to pardon and to save us: And that Covenant giveth it (as is said) on the whole Condition. It is true, that Life is oft especially ascribed to Christs Resurrection and Life, and deliverance from guilt to his Death: But that is not because his Death is no part of the Meritorious Cause of our Life, or Holiness and Glory, nor his *Life* a Meritorious Cause of our Pardon by fulfilling all Righteousness; but because *Guilt* was it that was to be expiated by his Death as a Sacrifice, and so it did but purchase by pleasing God, the gift of our life: But his Resurrection

and

and heavenly Interceſſion did more than purchaſe, even further communicate and perfect our Life. Chriſts Death was in order of Nature firſt ſatiſfactory for ſin, and then meritorious of Life; and his perfect Active Obedience was firſt and directly meritorious both of Pardon and Glory.

I paſs by the Controverſie which Mr. *Gataker* moſt inſiſteth on, Whether to deliver from Death, and to give Life, be not all one? And whether according to the Law of Innocency, he that had no ſin or guilt of Commiſſion or Omiſſion, had not right to the Life there given?

Qu. 41. *Whether Chriſts being the End of the Law for Righteouſneſs, doth ſignifie that he ſo fulfilled* Adams *Law in our ſtead, as that it juſtifieth us by* Fac hoc & vives.

Anſ. 1. The affirmers quite miſtake *Moſes* and *Paul*, in thinking that it is the Law of Innocency, which the words cited by *Paul* deſcribe; when indeed it was *Moſes* Law of Works, which had Sacrifices and Promiſes of Pardon, which the other had not (of which before.) 2. Chriſt is there ſaid to be the End of all the Law as to its ſhadows, types, and conjunct Promiſes. *The Law was given by* Moſes, *but Grace and Truth* (that is, the things promiſed and typified) *came by Jeſus Chriſt.* The confounding of theſe Laws confoundeth many in theſe Controverſies.

Qu. 42. *Whether the ſufferings of Chriſt merit our freedom from nothing but what he ſuffered in our ſtead?*

Qu. 43. *And whether hence it follow that his ſufferings merit not our deliverance from death ſpiritual and habitual, or actual pravity, becauſe Chriſt ſuffered them not?*

Anſ. To the 42d. The affirmation of the firſt is a corrupting addition to the Word of God. 1. He ſuffered not many temptations, which yet by the merit of his ſufferings we are freed from. 2. He ſuffered not many relative evils, as bad Parents, bad Teachers, a bad Wife, and all the attendant croſſes in buying and ſelling, croſſes from bad Tenants, or Landlords, *&c.* which the merit of his ſuffering delivereth many from. 3. He ſuffered not the torment of an accuſing Conſcience. 4. Nor Gods hatred or diſpleaſure. 5. Nor the many miſeries which ſin in its own nature bringeth to the Soul (as painful cares, fears, fruſtrations, deceits, *&c.*) 6. Nor corruption in the grave. 7. Nor the final Sentence [*Go ye curſed into everlaſting fire.*] 8. Nor the proper Execution of that Sentence.

Yet he delivereth ſome Believers from all theſe, and all from ſome, by the merits of his ſufferings. For it was not the *juſt ſame puniſhment* that was due to all Believers that he ſuffered, but that which was fit to make him a meet Sacrifice, which was the *tantundem vel æquivalens, conſideratis conſiderandis.*

Ad 43. The affirmative ſubverteth our Faith. Chriſts Death merited the full pardon of all pardoned ſin: But the pardon of ſin is the pardon of the deſerved puniſhment of ſin (and of the ſin as related to that puniſhment.) But certainly the privation of Gods illuminating, ſanctifying Spirit, and its helps and fruits, is a great part of the puniſhment of ſin, *Pſal.* 81. 11, 12. *Rom.* 1. 28. 2 *Theſ.* 2. 10, 12. To be given up to mens own counſels, wills, luſts, vile affections, to a reprobate mind; to have eyes and ſee not, hard hearts to believe lies, *&c.* Sin is no farther pardoned than this puniſhment is by ſanctifying grace remitted, and removed.

The

The Scripture doth not ascribe to Christs Sacrifice, some part only of our pardon of sin, but the whole, *Rev.* 1. 5. He washed us from our sins in his blood; and so he is the propitiation for them, 1 *John* 2. 2. & 4. 3. He made purgation of them on the Cross, *Heb.* 1. 3. He died for them, and gave himself for them, 1 *Cor.* 15. 3. *Gal.* 1. 4. 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. *Heb.* 10. 12. & 9. 28. *Rom.* 3. 25. Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through Faith in his blood, for the remission of sins that are past, *Acts* 22. 16. & 13. 38, *&c.* And the *pœna damni* is part of the punishment to be forgiven: Therefore, *Rom.* 4. 7. *Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, &c.* But no man is blessed that is unholy, and separated from God. As we all sinned and came short of the Glory of God, and spiritual Death is by the objecter confessed to be part of our punishment; so pardon containeth the remission of that punishment.

And it is falsly supposed that Christs Death is not secondarily meritorious of *more than pardon*, even of all that his Active Obedience meriteth; of which before.

Pardon is, 1. *In jure*, a Remission of the Obligation to punishment; giving us *Jus impunitatis*; and this giveth us Right to all that grace and blessedness, which by sin we lost a Right to.

2. Declarative by Sentence, which giveth us a *Jus judicatum*.

3. Executive, which actually freeth us from the *pœna damni & sensus*. And so Sanctification is a part of Executive Pardon, so far as it giveth what for sin we were penally deprived of. This is all plain and sure.

Qu. 44. *Seeing we our ſelves bear that part of the Curſe which lieth in Death ſpiritual, doth it follow that Chriſts Sufferings were not to free us from it, when we bore it, and not he?*

Anſ. It is not denied that part of the puniſhment of ſin is born by the Elect themſelves, (which the former Objecters deny:) And therefore that *Pardon* is not abſolutely perfect at firſt: Death and Divine denials of the Spirit and Grace, are ſuch penalties. And Chriſt died not (nor obeyed) to ſave us from that which we are not to be ſaved from, but was excepted from Pardon. But the Objecter can never prove that the Merit of Chriſts Sufferings (though he ſuffered not ſpiritual death, or privation of Gods Image) doth not free us, 1. From ſo much of ſpiritual death or pravity as we are freed from: 2. And from the duration of it for ever: Or elſe it merited not one half our pardon. To be waſhed from our ſins in his blood, can be no leſs than to be freed from the guilt which is the obligation to puniſhment firſt, and conſequently from the puniſhment it ſelf.

Qu. 45. *Is this the reaſon of our deliverance from the Law, and being dead to it, becauſe we ſuffered everlaſting Hell fire equivalently in Chriſts ſufferings.*

Anſ. When men once depart from the Scripture, their corrupt additions hardly keep bounds.

1. It's well that this Objecter implieth, that it was not the *Idem*, but the *Æquivalens* that Chriſt ſuffered, as to our debt.

2. That which made Chriſts Sacrifice to be *æquivalent* to our endleſs damnation, was not that it was as *great* a proportion of ſuffering (*pœnæ ſenſûs & damni*) as all ours together would have been:

But

But becauſe the dignity and perfection of the perſon made it an apt means for God that would pardon us, to accept as a Sacrifice, and ſo as fit a means to the ends of Government, as our damnation would have been (and fitter.) This is the æquivalency.

3. We ſuffered not damnation at all in Chriſt; nor doth God or his Law take or reckon us to have done ſo; but only to receive the pardon and other benefits freely given us, which he in the perſon of a Mediator, and not in *our perſon* merited.

4. We are *dead to the Law*, both as a Covenant of Perfection, and as the Law of *Moſes* to the Jews, becauſe Chriſt nailed the latter to his Croſs, or did abrogate it as ſuch to the Jews, and to thoſe Gentiles that needed to be Proſelytes; and the former ceaſed by the Fall and Promiſe; (But it is the Jewiſh Law that *Paul* ſpeaketh of.) And alſo in our *believing acceptance* of this liberation, and of the Law of Chriſt.

Qu. 46. *Is it true that Chriſts Active Obedience only meriteth Heaven for us; and therefore it only meriteth the Spirit or Holineſs which is but Heaven begun?*

Anſ. Both are falſe: His Active and Paſſive Righteouſneſs merit Pardon, Holineſs and Glory. And their proof from [*Fac hoc & vives*] is upon a great miſtake, and no proof.

Qu. 47. *Is it true, that becauſe Regeneration is the beginning of Heaven, and Chriſts Obedience imputed giveth a right to the whole, therefore it giveth a right to the beginning, and therefore Repentance which followeth Juſtification can be no Condition of it?*

Anſ. It is a fancy ſpun by a a miſtaken mind, to oppoſe the plain Word of God.

1. If it would hold, it would exclude *Faith* as well as *Repentance*, from being a Condition or Antecedent to Juſtification, contrary to the Goſpel: For Faith is as much a grace of the Spirit as Repentance is. And it is not true that impenitent Infidels are juſtified, though they may be predeſtinate to be firſt called, and then juſtified, and then glorified, *Rom.* 8. 30.

2. That which goeth before Pardon (and that as a Condition) goeth before Juſtification: But Repentance goeth before Pardon, *Acts* 5. 31. *Luke* 24. 47. & 3. 3. *Acts* 2. 38. & 3. 19. & 8. 22. 1 *John* 1. 9. *Mark* 4. 12. But of this I have given large proof elſewhere.

3. All the grace of the Spirit is a preparation for Heaven; But that eminent gift of the Spirit, which in Scripture is called the *Seal*, *Earneſt*, and firſt *Fruit*, is promiſed upon *repenting* and *believing*, and therefore followeth them, and is, 1. The Habit of Divine Love, which is the New Nature, and more than the firſt ſeed of grace: 2. And the Spirit related to us as an in-dwelling, poſſeſſing Agent of Chriſt to ſanctifie us to the end. 3. And in thoſe times to many, the extraordinary gifts of Miracles, Tongues, *&c.*

1. Faith and Repentance went before Baptiſm in the Adult, even as a Condition of it and its benefits, *Mark* 1. 4. *Acts* 13. 34. & 19. 4. *Matt.* 3. 11. *John* 1. 26. *Mark* 16. 16. *John* 4. 1. *Acts* 2. 38, 41. & 8. 12, 13, 36, 37, 38. & 9. 18. & 22. 16. But that gift of the Spirit which is called the *Earneſt*, *Seal*, and *firſt Fruit*, was either given in, or after Baptiſm ordinarily (though to *Cornelius* before) but not before Faith and Repentance. It is called therefore,

fore, [*Baptizing with the Holy Ghost.*] See *Mat.* 3. 11. *Acts* 1. 5, & 2. 33. 38, & 8. 15. 17, & 19. 2. *Rom.* 5. 5. *Tit.* 3. 5.

2. And the Spirit is said to be promised and given to believers, after faith, and because they were adopted sons: *Eph.* 1. 13. *Prov.* 1. 23. *Gal.* 4. 6. & 3. 14. *Rom.* 8. 15, 16. 30. 2 *Cor.* 1. 22. & 5. 5. Therefore our Divines commonly put *Vocation* as giving the first acts of *Faith* and *Repentance* before *Sanctification*, as *Rom.* 8. 30. doth before Justification and Glorification. And yet *Faith* and *Repentance* are gifts of the Spirit too, and so are many commoner gifts in unsanctified men: But as the daylight is seen before the Sun rising, and as Satan is not said to possess all that he tempteth; So some gifts of the Spirit, and some motions and operations of it, go before the proper giving of the Spirit itself, and his possessing us.

3. It is no absurdity, but the wise order of God, that one gift of the Spirit shall be antecedent to another, and the reception and exercise of it by us, be a condition of that other. For God will morally induce us to our duty by suitable motives. He that denieth this subverteth the Gospel.

4. I have elsewhere at large proved the falshood of this Doctrine, that Impenitent Infidels are justified by the imputation of Christs Righteousness. It is enough that Christs righteousness is reputed by God to be the meritorious cause of all our grace even of justification before we are justified.

Qu. 48. *How can faith or repentance entitle us to that righteousness of Christ which must first give us a right to themselves and all Grace?*

Ans. 1. Faith and Repentance give us not a Title

tie in ſtrict ſence, but the Covenant or Promiſe, that is, the Goſpel Donation is our Title, and Faith and Repentance are but *Conditions* of our *Title*, which on ſeveral accounts make us morally capable receivers of Right.

2. Chriſts Righteouſneſs did merit all grace of God, before it juſtifieth us, and we are reputed righteous by it. It is a great error to ſay that we muſt be reputed righteous by Chriſts Righteouſneſs given and imputed to us to that uſe, before we can have any fruits of the merits of his righteouſneſs. Even the outward call of the Goſpel is a fruit of it.

Qu. 49. *Is it true that we muſt be practical Antinomians unleſs we hold that only Chriſts active righteouſneſs merited grace and glory for us?*

Qu. 50. *Is this proved by* Rom. 7. 4.

Anſ. 1. Some mens words are uſed to hide the ſenſe, and not to open it. What is the meaning of *Practical Antinomianiſm*? Is it to be the oppoſers of all Gods Laws? or only ſome and which? And doth he not mean that the judgment muſt be firſt againſt them.

How far are we under the Law; and how far not? 1. The Law of Innocency as a Covenant requiring perfect, perſonal obedience as the neceſſary condition of life, we are not under. It ceaſed by the firſt ſin, *ceſſante ſubditi capacitate*: We muſt not ſuppoſe that God ſaith to all ſinners: *You ſhall be ſaved if you be not ſinners. Conditione præterita Lex tranſit in ſententiam.*

2. We are not under the Law of *Moſes* as ſuch; even that which was written in ſtone is done away, 2 *Cor.* 3. 7, &c.

If this be Antinomianiſm, I am an Antinomian that have written ſo much againſt them. 3. We

3. We are only under the Law of Christ, into whose hand all power is given: And that is 1. The Law of reprieved and redeemed nature: 2. All his supernatural revelation, and so much of *Moses* Law as he hath assumed. If the objecter think that we are under any other, so do not I, except the subordinate Laws of men.

2. That Law of Grace which we have, and that freedom from the Law of Works, are merited both by Christs Active and Passive righteousness.

Ad. Qu. 50. *Rom.* 7. 4. hath no such thing, but only that Christ hath delivered men from the bondage of the Law of works which did neither justify nor sanctify, and hath subjected and engrafted us unto himself, that we might by him be made holy unto God.

[*Conclusion.*]

THe Reader may now perceive what abundance of great notional errours some men have corrupted the Doctrine of Justification with, by presumptuous spinning webs out of their own fancies, raising one errour out of another, departing from the Word of God.

I. A radical errour is, that the Law of Innocency made to *Adam* is it that justifieth us, by its *fac hoc & vives*, as *fulfilling it in Christ.*

II. Another is that it is that Covenant of perfection which *Paul* meaneth by the Law of Works, and the *fac hoc*, &c. And that the Jews Law was such as made Innocency its condition of life.

III. That

III. That the sense of *Adams* Law was, [*Do this by thyself or another, or else thou or thy surety shall die.*]

IV. That Christ did obey and suffer, merit and satisfy, in so full and strict a representing and personating every one of the Elect, as that they did and suffered it in and by Christ, in the sence of the Law of Works, or in Gods account; and that it was not in the third person of a mediator, to communicate the Effects freely as he pleased by another Covenant. And so that Gods imputing righteousness to us, is his accounting us to have done and suffered in Law sense what Christ did. This is the root of all the rest, subverting the Gospel itself.

V. And so that God *accounteth* us to be *Innocent*, and never to have sinned by Omission or Commission from birth to death, and to *have all that is required to merit Heaven, because we did it in Christ*; and also to *have suffered in Christ for our sins*, the curse *threatned* to us, and (as the last objecter saith) *eternal damnation equivalently*: And so we had sin and no sin: And Christ must die and we must pray, for the pardon of that sin, which in Gods account or imputation we never had.

VI. When the Text tells us that, [*Faith is imputed to us for Righteousness,*] & that [*Righteousness is imputed to believers*] that is, [*They are accounted righteous according to the justifying Covenant of Grace, upon their believing in Christ, for his meritorious Righteousness and Sacrifice, giving them, by the new Covenant their gracious relation, to God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, with right to further Grace and Glory,* they tell us that [*by Faith*] is *not* meant [*Faith*] but [*Christs Righteousness,*] and by [*Righteousness imputed to us,*] is meant [*Gods accounting us to have done all that Righte-*

Righteousness by Christ which he did for us.]

Many more such humane inventions corrupting our Faith (at least in notion) too many fight for, as if they were necessary truths of God.

Postscript.

READER, *the Author of the following objections is Mr.* Stephen Lob : *I had thought not to have named him, till I saw but Yesterday his Books of Free Grace, which I never before heard of, though it was printed almost ten year ago : It is so considerable a confutation of Antinomian errours that I commend it to thy reading.*

And being my self in great pain expecting death, and like to write in these Controversies no more, that I have once more as a Speculator or Watchman blown the Trumpet to warn men of the danger of the Other Gospel *that subverteth the Gospel of Christ, I have this Peace of Conscience that the blood of the seduced will not be required at my hands.*

And if that M. S. *of Mr.* Stone *of* New-England *which Mr.* Lob *so praiseth, may by him be yet recovered, I intreat his endeavour: In which I cannot doubt but Mr.* Increase Mather *will assist him, tho his name be prefixt among the twelve.*

And I commend to some honest Bookseller to reprint Mr. Thomas Welds *History of the* New-England *Antinomian Libertinism, it being out of press.*

And I hereby intreat Mr. William Manning *of* Suffolk (*if living*) *to Print the excellent Treatise of Justification of his which I have long ago read. And Mr.* Samuel Clerk (*Author of the* Annot.) *to Print his*

his sound Treatise (which I long ago read) on the same Subject.

And though my own Judgment be for the Imputation of Christs Passive, Active, and Habitual righteousness, dignified by the Divine as the full and the sole meritorious cause of all Grace and Glory, as making up the condition of his Mediatorial Covenant imposed on him by God; Yet I intreat the Learned Reader to peruse the Writings of those great Divines that are for the Imputation of the Passive only (Ursine, Olevan, Paræus, Scultetus, Wendeline, Beckman, *and the rest, with* Camero, Placæus, *and all that party of famous* French *Divines who all effectually confute the false sense of Imputation of the Active Righteousness which Mr.* Bradshaw *confuteth with many others (as if we had done it by Christ, and were our selves the Subjects of it, and are justified by that Law that condemneth us.)*

Jan. 20. 1690.

R. B.

An Answer to some Animadversions of a Friend, tending to the further explication of some passages which through brevity were not understood.

§. 1. SIR, Your notes have so much Judgment and moderation and so little, if any thing contrary to what I assert, that they require nothing from me, but a repeated explication of that which you observed not as before explained: But when it is enough for me to explain my *own* Words and Doctrine, you put me on another task to seek after the explication of another mans; which I am not obliged to on any account, but for your Satisfaction. It is enough for me to speak true Doctrine in the most intelligible manner that I can without examining whether other mens expressions be sound or apt.

§. 2. I begin with your own Notes: And 1. I hope that few are so ignorant (that meddle in these matters) as to doubt of what you say, that no one term much less one Metaphor or similitude can adequately express any of the Mysteries of Grace, and no one Metaphor must be carried too far; *Omne simile est etiam dissimile*: And all set together so far as they are thereto intended must instruct us.

§. 3. I know none but the Socinians that think a Mediator and a Sponsor inconsistent; or deny Christ to be a Sponsor. And methinks your words for

for their consistency, import a greater difference between them than there is. It is part of Christs Mediation to be a Sponsor: These terms therefore express no difference but between the *whole* and the *part*.

But what a *Sponsor* Christ is, is all the doubt which I a little opened, and you pass by. It is not agreed by expositors what the word ἔγγυος meaneth in that one only place of Scripture where it is used. Very learned expositors think that as *Moses* was called *Gods Mediator* or *Sponsor* to *the people* as being his Spokesman and in his name assuring them that this was Gods Covenant which he would perform, and returning the peoples answer to God, and praying for them but not undertaking for them, and personating them; so Christ is here likened to him, and called the *Mediator* and *Sponsor* of the new and better Covenant, not as he personateth or undertaketh for Covenanting Subjects, but only as he representeth God the Father to man, and is his Sponsor to us.

But as *Paul* saith he is not a Mediator of one, so I see not but (though chiefly he be Gods Sponsor to man) yet withal he be there called a *Sponsor* also as well as a Mediator for man to God: But all the doubt is what a *Sponsor* for man he is.

And first we must enquire what Covenant he is a Sponsor of? No doubt but Gods Covenant with the Mediator as such, is *one*, and Gods and the Mediators Covenant with man solemnized in baptism is another: And yet no doubt but these two have such relation as that in some sort or respect they may be called one. He that saith they are not two is plainly confuted by the constitutive defining parts, the *Divers Parties*, *Matter*, *Terms* and *Ends*. It was not said to Christ, but by Christ, [*Repent*

and

and believe in Christ, or be damned.] Pardon and Salvation are not offered to Christ to be received by Faith in himself. Yet as the Laws of the Land though several, are *One Instrumentum Regiminis*: So we call all the Laws of Nature usually singularly. *The Law of Nature*, (and so we say, *The Civil Law, the Canon Law, Gods Law*, &c.) Now the question is, what Covenant Christ was the Sponsor of? 1. In his own proper Covenant he did *Spondere & præstare*, to suffer for us, and to obey for us, (in the just sence in due place explained,) to rise and ascend for us, to intercede for us, to Teach us, Guide us, give out his Spirit, and to Justifie and Sanctifie and Glorifie his chosen: So that it was part of his *Undertaking* and *Performance* to do all this *for us*; and this may well be called his becoming a *Sponsor* for us, and to be *made to us, Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification and Redemption.*

In our Covenant with Christ, he is the *Imposer* and *Stipulator*, and we are to Promise for our part, to be done by his promised help. But on *Gods part*, it is in *this* that he is the Sponsor, and not in the *former*, where God the Father is the Promiser to Christ, and not Christ to himself as a Covenanter: So that it is in *one Covenant* that he promiseth *to God for Man*, and in *another* that he promiseth *for God to Man*: And the question is which of these Covenants it is that the Apostle calleth him the Surety of? If you say that the Apostle taketh both here as parts of *One*, and so meaneth both; I find no proof of this in the Text: And if it were so, it is all one; for it were then spoken of the *whole*, but respectively to what Christ did in the two which are the *parts*: Indeed it is διαθήκη, and not συνθήκη, that is the Covenant mentioned in the Text: and as *Grotius in præfat. ad notas in N. T.*

hath copiously shewed, it is a Divine Disposal, Law, Imposition, or Statute containing the terms of Life, that is meant by διαθήκη: And *cap.* 7. 22. as it is said, yet *Jesus was made a surety of a better Testament.* And *c.* 8. 6. *He hath obtained a more excellent Ministry, by how much he is the Mediator of a better Covenant* [*which was stablished on better Promises.*] It is the same thing which our Translators call a *Testament* in one Chapter and a Covenant in the other, and it seems that a *Surety* and a Mediator here do mean the same thing in Christ: And the whole context sheweth that it is Gods Promise or Covenant, and Law of Grace made to man that is here meant, and that Christs Office and Undertaking and Performance is presupposed. And so it is the Fathers Sponsor and Mediator to man that is meant here directly, and mans Sponsor and Mediator towards God by Connotation; but so as in other Texts, as *Cap.* 9. 15. that part also is directly expressed, and Christs death made a part of his Mediation.

§ 4. The Question being not then whether Christ be *Mediator*, or *Sponsor*, or the *Second Adam*, but what these words signifie, that which is to be noted by the Reader is, 1. What it is hereon that we assert; and whether that be enough. 2. And what it is that we deny as too much, and false.

§ 5. 1. And for the first I explained it here, and more fully in my *Treat. of Justifying Righteousness*: And to repeat as oft as any one will call for it that hath not leisure to read it already done is tedious. In short ["Christ in the Common "Nature of man made under the Law of Innocen- "cy, of *Moses* and that proper to the Mediator, "did in the undertaken Person of a Mediator, Spon-

"for

" for, interposing Friend and Saviour, perfectly ful-
" fil all these, and give up himself to suffering as
" a Sacrifice for Mans Sin, that by the Merit and
" Satisfaction of him that was God and Man, and
" Mans undertaking Mediator and Sponsor, doing
" and suffering because we had sinned, and deser-
" ved suffering, and that for our sakes, and partly
" in our stead, the ends of God as Governour by
" the Law of Innocency, and *Moses* might be ob-
" tained to his Glory, without our fulfilling of
" those Laws or Suffering the deserved Penalty,
" and God in consistency with his Wisdom, Holi-
" ness and Justice, might for these Merits and Sa-
" tisfaction of Christ give all things into his Hands
" as the Redeemer, even all Power in Heaven
" and Earth, and make him Lord of the Dead and
" Living, and Head over all things to the Church,
" and give him the Keys, and commit all Judg-
" ment to him; that by the will of the Father
" he might make with faln redeemed Man a Law
" and Covenant of Grace, giving them Himself in
" incomprehensible Union, and with himself his
" indwelling sanctifying comforting Spirit of A-
" doption, with a Covenant Right to Pardon, Ju-
" stification, Adoption and Glory, if they will pe-
" nitently accept it, by a fiducial practical belief:
" And calling Sinners, to this Faith and Re-
" pentance, and effectually drawing his Elect,
" might by this Covenant give them as soon as
" they so believe, an actual right to that impuni-
" ty, Grace and Glory which was antecedently
" given conditionally to all. And might finally
" perform all this to them.

In plain and full words, this is that we assert, and the Office which by the Word *Sponsor*, *Mediator* and *Second Adam* we mean.

§. 5. I have elsewhere told you that there are many sorts of Sponsors. 1. There is one that Antecedently maketh himself a Party in the Covenant and Bond: As when my Friend is bound with me in the same bond for a Debt or Duty: If the Law to *Adam* had been such as this, took in Christ also into the same bond, and had meant [*One of you shall perfectly obey or suffer*;] Then that Law would have had nothing against *Adam* at all, because all was fulfilled by Christ: And it bound but disjunctively, one or the other. Then Christs Obedience or Suffering would not have been *satisfactio*, which is *solutio æquivalentis alias indebiti, & solutio recusabilis*; but it would have been *solutio ejusdem & non recusabilis* according to the bond.

2. There is a subsequent Sponsor that was not before bound, but as a Friend after interposeth, and offereth (not in the Person of the debtor, but yet in his stead) to pay the debt: and this upon such terms as to the Debtors deliverance as he thinks best; and so may take him as Debtor to himself, and put various limits, and Conditions upon his Discharge: And such a Sponsor is Christ for Man. Many more distinctions of *Sureties* are here considerable.

3. But some men take a *Surety* here to be the same *Persona civilis, quamvis non naturalis*, with the Offender and Debtor; as if *we* did *Legally, Morally* or *Civilly* that which Christ did *naturally*: As indeed an allowed Representative, Servant, or Agent and Attourney is: If I be bound to pay an hundred pound, the Law and Bond meant not that I must needs do it with my own hands, but if I send my Servant or Friend with the Money, it is *Civilly, Legally* and *Morally* done by me, because he was my lawful Instrument: I did it by him.

II. The

II. The Doctrine then, which I deny as subverting the Christian Religion is especially these three errours following.

I. That the true meaning of *Adams* Law or Covenant was to bind *him or his surety* disjunctively; *viz.* Thou shalt obey thy self or another (Christ) for thee, or else thou shalt die, or Christ for thee.] 1. Gods Word saith no such thing. 2. Then Christ had been an Antecedent Sponsor. 3. Yea and a party equally bound. 4. Then a Saviour and Grace had been by that Law: which is false. 5. Then *Adam* had been no Sinner; for it was but *He or Christ* and not *He and Christ* that were bound to keep the Law, by this Doctrine. 6. Then no Death had been due to *Adam.* 7. Then that Law was not broken at all: for it bound but disjunctively. 8. Then the Law condemneth no man. 9. Then our Death and the Curse of the Earth were injuries, for we kept the Law by Christ. 10. Then the Law of Innocency is it by which we are justified (which is false.) 11. Then there is no place for pardon. 12. Nor for a new Law to give us pardon upon terms or new Conditions: This is to subvert the Gospel.

Yet this is commonly said by the adversaries, that *Adam* after his fall was justified by that same Law, as saying, *Do this and Live*, because he kept it by *Christ*, or Christ in his Name and stead, so that *it justifieth Adam:* (which Mr. *Wotton de Reconc.* hath at large coufuted.) If they say that the same Law or Covenant commanded *Adam to obey* perfectly and *his surety also in his stead* conjunctly, and condemned both *Adam* for Sin and his Surety for the same, then both must suffer as both must obey, and each beareth his own part. It is a fundamental fiction leading on many other

errours, to say that the Law of Innocency as it *commanded* Adam *Obedience*, or *as it threatned Death to him* was fulfilled by Christ for him. That Law *commanded* Adam only *Personal perfect perpetual Obedience*: It mentioned or meant no *Vicarius obedientiæ aut pœnæ: Dum alius solvit, aliud solvitur.* Anothers obeying or suffering was no fulfilling of the Law as *it commanded* Adam: The Law commandeth each subject distinctly and personally: Christ fulfilled all the Law as it *obliged himself*, and that *for* Adams *Redemption* who had broken it: But the same Law *as it obliged* Adam was broken by *Adam*, and not kept by him or any for him: It is not that Law that gave man a Saviour, but the Mercy of the Offended Lawgiver. To say the *Hoc fac, & vives*, in that Law giveth us right to Life, and justifieth us as perfect obeyers, and so no Sinners, is to deny the Gospel.

Many say indeed that Christ *satisfied* the Law for us: but 1. That proveth that the Obligation of it on us was *not fulfilled*: For *satisfaction* is *solutio recusabilis tantidem, loco solutionis ejusdem.* 2. But it is an improper speech to say that [*the Law is satisfied*] And it meaneth no more but that [*the end of Government by that Law is obtained.*] And it is properly *satisfaction* only to the *Lawgiver*, and not to the Law: For the Law in it's *sence* admits not of *satisfaction*, (though it hath nothing against it:) It is only the *subjects* Obedience that it commandeth, and *his death* as satisfaction for sin that it demandeth. It is the *Lawgiver* as he is *above his own Law* and hath power to *pardon*, that is *satisfied*: Though as tropically some say, that *Finis Legis est Lex*, so we will not contend with them that tropically say, *Christ satisfied the Law*, while they mean but that he satisfied the Lawgiver in obtaining

ing the End of the Law. But Christ perfectly fulfilled the Law as it obliged himself, upon his Sponsion. And that Law justified him, but no man else. It is only the New Covenant that justifieth us.

II. The second Errour to the same purpose, is, that though Christ and *Adam* were two *Natural Persons*, yet they were *One Person* in a *Civil*, *Legal* or *Reputative* sense, in Christs obeying and suffering; and so that what Christ did and suffered in his *own Natural Person*, he did and suffered in *Adams*, and every Elect mans *Civil*, *Legal*, or *Reputative Person*. This is but the consequent of the former Errour. He may be called our *Representer* in a limited sense, *in tantum & ad hoc* (for there is no hope of holding our opposers to Scripture phrase:) But such a strict full personating Representation as is here described, denieth the substance of the Gospel. There are indeed several Cases in which one in Law or Civil sense doth personate another: When the Law alloweth one to do the thing by another, that thing is morally done by himself; *e.g.* by my Servant, Proxie, Attorney, Agent, in Cases so allowed by the Law. It is I that pay the debt which my Servant, or any *Vicarius* allowed by Law payeth for me in my name. Christ did not thus pay or suffer in our names as our Legal Person; but for us and in our stead as a *subsequent Sponsor* in the person of a Mediator; so that it cannot be said that *we did it Legally by him*; else all the forenamed absurdities would follow; and specially that *Legally* we *never sinned*, and never deserved punishment, nor need either Pardon, or the Sacrifice of Christ for Pardon. It's certain that Christ never sinned, but obeyed perfectly from first to last: And if we did this *Legally by him*, we sinned not in Law sense, that is, not truly at all. When

we shew that it is a palpable contradiction to say, that we were perfectly obedient in and by Christ, from birth to death, and yet that Christ must suffer for our sins; it's strange to see how some men satisfie themselves with wriggling, or huddling out a few insignificant words, unfit to satisfie any other.

And if Christs *Habitual* Perfection be also so imputed to us, in a Legal sense, we were *habitually* perfect from birth to death. Whence it is that some assert an equality of such Perfection in all Christians: The consequents I will not trouble you with reciting; nor stay to enquire whether also his *Divine Righteousness* be ours in such a Law sense, and so Man be deified.

Either Christ was our Legal Person *before we were born*, or from *the time of our being*, or from *the time of our believing* only. 1. Before we had a Being we were no sinners, nor bound to obey; and therefore needed not to obey or suffer by another. 2. When we were born, we were not in Christ, and perhaps not Believers till old Age: And so the Elect should Legally be just while they are Infidels, and never sin even in their state of Enmity. 3. If only since believing we were so personated by Christ, then his Righteousness is not imputed to us for all the time of our unregeneracy, and then we never sinned in Law sense after our believing. If they say that *in suffering he represented* us as unregenerate, and in his obedience as Believers only, then he suffered not for our sins after believing, nor obeyed to merit pardon of our sins before. If they say that *so far as we are sinners, we Legally suffered in him*, and as Believers *further* to *merit glory* we obeyed by him, the contradiction of this is shewed before. If we obeyed

so

so far as to merit glory by the Law of Works, then we never sinned: And if we suffered in him, for all sins of Omission and Commission, we merited glory without any other obedience: For the Law requireth nothing but Innocency as necessary to life. He that hath no sin, doth perfectly obey. And pardon of all sin of Omission and Commission, is the pardon of all punishment of *Sense* and *Loss*, and so of the loss of promised Life.

Besides that, one that is reputed to have Legally fulfilled the Law, must be unjustly corrected by the punishment of temporal afflictions or death, or loss of the Spirit and Grace, and hath present right to the reward of that Covenant, or deliverance from all penal evil at least; so that this Doctrine of strict Legal personating Representation, overthroweth the New Covenant and Law of Christ, and all his Kingdom of Grace, and all Religion.

III. The third fundamental Errour which we deny and oppose, is, that the *Union between Christ* and (the *Elect*, say some, or) *Believers* (say others) *is so near, as that his very personal Holiness, Righteousness and Sufferings, are in Law sense truly our Holiness, Righteousness and Sufferings* as the accidents of our persons: As if Christ and *Adam*, and every Christian, were one and the same subject of Holiness, Righteousness, Suffering, Merit or Satisfaction. Yet they dare not say that the Union (like the hypostatical) warranteth such a community of Properties or Attributes, as that we may be said to be Divinely Righteous, perfectly Holy, never to have sinned, to have satisfied for our selves, to have merited our own Salvation, and many such like; as seeing the evil of the consequents, though not of the premises.

And

And here sometime they abuse the similitude of a Husband and Wife; whereas they are distinct persons, and one is not wise, just or guiltless, because the other is so; nor hath the Wife any propriety so much as in extrinsick goods, but by contract in the proportion granted by the Husband.

Some abuse the similitude of a *Head* and *Members*; whereas Natural Head and Members make one Natural Body; but so do not Christ and Believers: And a Political Head and Members are distinct persons, and one is not guiltless, righteous, wise or good, because the other is so. But of this more before, and elsewhere. Some here abuse the similitude of Christs being the second *Adam*, which you here (though not to this Errour) insist upon. And then they feign us, 1. To have been otherwise in *Adam* than we were; 2. And his sin to be otherwise imputed to us than it was; And 3. The similitude to extend further than it doth.

I. They feign us to have been *Personally in Adam*, whenas we were but seminally in him, and personally *from* him. 2. They feign us to have been in him by a certain Covenant, more than we were by Natural In-existence: And that his sin was *arbitrarily* by *God* through that Covenant, imputed to us further than we were guilty of it by any natural In-being or derivation: As if God made all men sinners by his arbitrary imputation of that to them, which in their natures they were not really guilty of: And as if our guilt of *Adams* sin, were just of the same sort as his; yea, and our guilt and his guilt were individual accidents of the same individual persons. But this (which Dr. *Twisse* oft confuteth in most of his Books) I have so largely and lately cleared in my published Disputations of *Original* sin, that you shall excuse me for not reciting it here. 3. The

3. The guilt of *Adams* sin being ours by *Natural Derivation*, cometh to *all alike*, *entirely* (according to the subjects capacity) and *necessarily*, without the consent of Parent or Child: Were *Adam* and all Parents unwilling to communicate it in generation, it would nevertheless be done: But Christ being not a Natural, but a contracting voluntary Root and Cause, doth communicate the fruits of his Righteousness only voluntarily by gift of Contract, at the time, in the manner, and measure, and on the terms that he seeth meet.

Here it is observable, 1. That both *Generation* and *Regeneration* have much unsearchable: How Souls generate Souls, and how the Spirit of Christ communicateth Grace to Souls, will never here be clearly apprehended, *John* 3. 8.

2. But it's certain that the Soul of the Parent is not the Soul of the Child, but some cause of it; and so that they are not one person.

3. We were not persons in *Adams* person, either the same or distinct.

4. But *Adam* caused us, not as a man maketh a garment, house, *&c.* but as one Candle doth light another, by some mysterious communication of its essence: so *formæ se multiplicant*, by the Divine benediction [*Increase and multiply,*] and primary causation.

5. Though we were not *personally*, but *virtually* and *seminally* in *Adam*, yet when that *seed* becometh a *person*, that *person* is *from Adam*, and so must proportionably be guilty: For who can bring a clean thing out of the essence of an unclean?

6. *Adam* had the *common Nature* of all men *specifically*, and *radically*, and *causally*, though as their nature *individually* constitute their persons, they existed not in him (as *extra causam.*)

7. So

7. So Jesus Christ did more assume the *common Nature* of faln Man, than the *persons* of any, or the *Nature* as *extra causas*, constituting the individual person.

8. *Bonum est ex causis integris; malum ex partiali:* Any defect maketh sin, but good must have entire causes. *Adams* sin causeth Original sin in all, *ex privatione causationis boni*: But if *Adam* had not sinned, every sin of their own would have made his Children unrighteous.

9. Christ having suffered in the common nature of man so far did it in their stead, and if you will needs so call it, so far represented fallen mankind, as that if they will personally receive him by faith, in the New Covenant, they shall not perish for *Adams* sin (or their own) (supposing that the parent is the accepter for the Infant) none perish for Original sin alone, without the addition of neglected and refused grace and remedy.

10. It is not only the Spiritual off-spring that Christ was a second *Adam* to, but partly to all mankind: For by a resurrection (though not to glory) all men are made alive by Christ, *Joh.* 5. 22, 23, 29. 1 *Cor.* 15. And all have a general conditional reconciliation and pardon, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19, 20. *Joh.* 3. 16. So that actual Justification resulteth to no man from Christs meer *representation* of him, but from his free donation by the New Covenant.

11. It's doubtless that all and only the holy seed, or faithful, are justified actually by Christs Righteousness: But in what sence it is imputed to them is all the doubt.

12. It's also doubtless that Christ *suffered* in our *stead*: But in what sense & how far is all the doubt: Because *we deserved it*, he voluntarily assumed it, to demonstrate

demonstrate Gods Justice, Mercy and Wisdom, and deliver us. You say before that, [*It was strictest Justice* that was shewed on Christ.] I would not strive about the word: It was *strictest Justice* as upon Christ: It was *perfect Justice* as to the ends of Government: But it was not *strictest Justice* as to us, nor as strictest signifieth the strict fulfilling or executing of the threatning of the Law: For it was not so executed, but the sinner mercifully pardoned.

§. 6. You note that Christ must take our guilt on him or else he could not take our punishment.

Ans. 1. He took not the *Reatum facti*, or the *Reatum culpæ*: For, 1. Our guilt was the accident of *one Subject*, and that which Christ took of *another*: Therefore the accidents were not the same. 2. Else sin however taken in its *reatus culpæ* would have made him culpable, and formally a sinner, and hateful to God, and like to Satan: Which he was not.

2. He took upon him the *Reatum pœnæ seu obligationem ad pœnam*: But not *ours* individually the same; but one of his own instead of *ours*: Christs guilt and ours were divers accidents of divers persons. The *obligations* nor the *Subjects* were not the same. Our obligation to punishment was an act of the Law which we broke: So was not Christs: That Law never bound him to punishment: But his *own* voluntary undertaking and his Fathers imposition. Our guilt was the occasion and reason of Christs assumed guilt: As our punishment individually was not it that he suffered, but his own punishment to prevent ours. He suffered the just for the unjust, to redeem us to God. God tells us plainly that Christ suffered for our sins, and was made

made sin, that is, a Curse or Sacrifice for sin for us, that we might not suffer. And cannot we receive this plain Gospel, without spinning so many additional webs of our own? Christs taking our guilt and punishment is no more, but his voluntary suffering in our stead, that we might be pardoned, not by that suffering immediately, but by his free donation in the Law of Grace, in his time and on his terms.

§. 7. "You note that though we are justified "by our own Faith, Repentance, and Obedience to "the Gospel against the false charge of being un- "believers, impenitent and ungodly; Yet to be free "from the curse of the Law, and obtaining right "to life, it is Christs Righteousness that we must "plead.

Ans. Very true thus, 1. It is only Christs Righteousness that we must plead as the Satisfying and meriting cause: 2. It is only the free Donation of the New Covenant which we must plead as our *Title* or *Fundamentum juris*, and *conveying cause* of right. 3. It is our *Faith* and *Repentance* (in various respects) which we must plead as the *conditio tituli præstita* which is the necessary moral receptive disposition of the Subject receiving. These things are all very plain and sure.

§ 8. You seem to doubt whether by the *Law of Works*. *Paul* meant not the *Law of Innocency*: And first you seem to mistake me as if I had said that he meant only the *Ceremonial Law*: I say no such thing. But the *whole Law of Moses*, considered meerly as *a law*, and by the *Jews ill separated* from Faith, and Grace was an operous Yoak, and of severe penalties to the transgressours; and though it gave pardon for some faults, it was not meerly for the task of sacrificing but for the great Sacri-

fice

fice typified: The Law as a Law doth only Command, and threaten and promise life to them that do all things written, but gave not grace to do it. The Jews left out the true sence of the types and promise which intended the Messiah, in whom it was that the promissory part of the Law was made; and thought the very task of duty or works would procure their acceptance and pardon when they failed. If you are not satisfied with this reason why *Paul* calleth it the *Law of Works*, find out a better if you can: But most certainly that is a great mistake that *Moses* and *Paul* describe the Law of Innocency? It's tedious to recite the proof.

1. It's enough that the Law of Innocency as a Covenant was *before ceased, cessante capacitate subditorum:* When all men had 2000 years been Originally and Actually sinners, will you feign God with all that solemnity to make such a Law as this, [*I know and you must know that no Son of* Adam *is Innocent: And I make now a Law that if you are, and will continue innocent you shall live: Else you shall die?* This is too gross to be feigned of God.

2. It is enough that when the Law was made they *were all under actual mercy* which was the grace of the new pardoned Covenant.

3. Yea that the Covenant of Grace had so long before been made with all fallen mankind in *Adam* and *Noah*, and renewed to *Abraham* with special promises: And doth God now repeal or hide it.

4. What need we more proof than so many Laws about Sacrificing and Confessing for forgiveness? Which the Law of Innocency knew not.

And why else did God deliver the Law as a God of *Redeeming mercy*, *I am the Lord thy God that brought*

brought thee out of Egypt, proclaiming his name, *Exod.* 34.6,7. *The Lord, the Lord God Merciful and Gracious, forgiving Iniquity, Transgression and Sin.*

6. Perule all the Contexts in *Paul*, and you will be satisfied. See *Camero de triplice fœdere* (which Dr. *Bolton* (of Liberty) was so taken with and magnifieth, and *Anthony Burges* of the Law, proving *Moses* Law to belong to a Covenant of Grace. But I have more fully opened all this in my *Methodus Theologiæ*. No doubt but *Pauls* disputes have great difficulty; but this much is very plain.

§ 9. Your next question is about the *nature of Faith, whether if it be placed in the will, and include consent, it be not confounded with Love, whose object is goodness.*

I have answered this oft and largely in divers Books, and therefore must here be excused from saying any more than this, *viz.* 1. You must distinguish between Faith Physically taken, and Faith morally taken. 2. Between its formal act and its material.

1. Physically some one natural act, constituted by one Object is called *Faith*: But morally taken it comprehendeth divers Physical Acts, both of the Intellect and Will: And as it is Justifying and Saving it is so taken: Yea morally it is sometime in Scripture taken largelier, for our Christian Faith, as God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost the Promise, Grace and Glory are all the constituting Objects of it in their truth and goodness; and sometime more narrowly as altogether distinct from Hope and Love; It is taken in the first sense when it is said to be the condition of Justification and Salvation.

And here what you said of the necessity of conjoyning the many similitudes which express Christs Office

Office to us, when but *one* of them in a Text is named, the same must be said of Faith in Christ. A Moral act which hath many Physical acts, must be named by some *one*, the rest being connoted or implied; for it would be uncomely to name them all in every mention of it.

Note also, that the name is varied according to what is specially noted in the Object, sometime Truth, sometime Goodness: So Christ saith, [*The Father hath loved you, because ye have loved me.* And *Paul, Grace be to all them that love the Lord Jesus in sincerity. If any man love not the Lord Jesus, let him be* Anathema Maranatha. And Christ, *Luke* 14. 26. and *Mat.* 10. *He that loveth any better than Christ, cannot be his Disciple.* And to be a *Disciple*, a *Christian* and a *Believer*, are all one in Scripture. But when it is the Goodness of *another Object* that is mentioned, the Act is another thing.

I suppose you will confess that no Faith in Christ and the Promise justifieth us, which doth not in that same instant include, 1. A belief of the Goodness, as well as the Truth of both. 2. A willingness to receive Christ and Grace as good; and a consent to the offer. And if these must concur in the same instant as necessary Conditions of our Justification or Reception of Christ and Grace, call them how you will, and say, *Consent* is an *Effect* of Faith, or a *part* of it, all's one to me: But I will say, that *Consent is an Effect of one Act of Faith strictly taken*; viz. *Assent*; but a *part of it* taken for *Justifying, Saving Faith.*

II. After many and long thoughts of this matter, I think they that will pretend to exactness, must say, that *Trust* is the *Formal Act* of Faith, as *Trustiness* or *Fidelity* is the *Formal Object*: And that the *Mate-*

 rial

rial Act is threefold, *Assent*, *Consent* and *Practice*; and none of these, no not *Assent* is the *Formal Act*. Both πίστις and *Fides* signifie *Trust*; yea and *Credere* too. And so *Fides*, as it signifieth *Fidelity*, and *Fides*, as it signifieth *Faith* or *Trust*, are the Formal Object and Act. *I Assent* to the *Truth* of the Gospel, because I *Trust* the *Veracity* or *Fidelity* of the Author. I *Consent* to the *Covenant*, because I *Trust* the Revealer, Offerer and Promiser. *I actually give up my self to Christ, because I Trust him.* Mr. *Pemble Vindicat. Grat.* hath accurately opened this.

I have in my Aphorisms, and oft said, that a Christian should rather try his Faith by the Consenting act, than the *Trusting* act; because many a one cannot find that they can Trust Christ, that yet find Consent. But I explain this, or recall it, as not well spoken: For indeed, though it be *Consent* by which we may surely know our Interest in the Justifying Covenant (specially when practically expresst,) yet *Affiance* or *Trust* is the *Formal Act* of Faith, and that *Consent* is but the *Material*. For if we *Trust* not Christs *Fidelity*, we can neither *Assent*, *Consent* or *Practise*. But when I spake as aforesaid, I followed the sense of most complaining Christians, who say, *They cannot Trust Christ*, meaning by *Trust*, that *Quieting of the mind*, which is but an *effect of Trust*: Whereas at that time they take Christ to be *Trusty*, and a *sufficient Saviour*, but are hindered from the *applying* and *quieting Effect*, by Ignorance, or doubting of their *own Trustiness*, and not of the *Trustiness* of Christ.

If I be tedious in repeating again my old similitudes, you must blame your self that are the cause.

Only one Physician can cure the Plague: Some slander him as a deceiver; He promiseth to cure

all that will take him for their Physician, and trust him: *Trusting* or *believing him* here includeth *materially, Believing his Word, Consenting to be his Patients, and coming to him for Physick.*

A Prince in *India* buyeth the Irish Rebels that had forfeited their lives, of the King, that they may lay down Arms, and go with him, and become his Subjects: He promiseth to every one of them a Lordship in *India*, a safe Ship thither, and pardon here; some call him a Deceiver, and distrust him: He tells them, if they *Trust* him, he will perform all this. Here *Trust*, the *Formal Act*, includeth as the *Material Acts*; 1. *Assenting to his Word as True*; 2. *Consenting to his Offer and Terms*; 3. *Practically venturing to lay down Arms*, and go with him in the Ship, and forsake their own Countrey.

Such is Faith in Christ, when it is made the Condition of Justification and Life. The *Formal and Material Acts together* constitute *Faith*, and not the *Formal*, or *one* of the Material (Assent) alone. (Nor hath Bishop *Downame* well confuted Mr. *Pemble* about the *Formal Act.*) In a word (true and plain) *Baptism*, our *Christening*, best tells us the Essence of *Justifying Faith:* For that is the *Sealing to us the Justifying Covenant*, that it may actually and solemnly deliver to us our part in Christ, and right to Pardon and Life, which is given us on no lower terms, than the *Fiducial Assent*, *Consent* and *Dedication* professed by us *essentially* in *Baptism.*

§ 10. Your next doubt is about the *various Objects of Faith in exercise* (Gods Omnipotency, (Truth, *&c.*) and the various uses of Faith ac-

cordingly. This is the point which Mr. *Lawſon* and I ſeemed ſomewhat to differ about: And I have in my Treatiſe of Juſtification ſaid ſo much of it, that you ſhall now excuſe me from any more than telling you, that in Sanctification, where one act really produceth one effect on our hearts, and another act another effect, each effect muſt be aſcribed to its proper act. But you muſt not think it is ſo in our Juſtification or Adoption, where that which we receive is a *RIGHT*, *Jus impunitatis & vitæ*, which is not the *Immediate Effect* of our *Act*, no nor *any Effect of it* at all, but of *Gods Donative Covenant*, of which our Faith is but a *Condition*, and no *Efficient Cauſe* of our *Right*. And therefore I doubt not ſtill to ſay, that we are *thus juſtified* as much by a *Conſenting to Chriſts Teaching and Sanctifying Grace*, as by *Conſenting to be juſtified by his Righteouſneſs*; or by fiducial taking him for our Teacher, Interceſſor and King, as taking him for a Satisfier and Meriter for us: Indeed it is undivided Taking Chriſt as Chriſt, that is the Juſtifying Condition, *John* 1. 10, 11, 12. 1 *John* 5. 10, 11, 12.

§ 11. In the end you deſire me to anſwer, *What Righteouſneſs is meant*, Rom. 5. *By the obedience of one many are made righteous.*

Anſ. The meaning is, *By the Merit of Chriſts Active and Paſſive* (yea *Habitual*) *Righteouſneſs* (*alſo*) *exalted in dignity by his Divine Perfection, all faln Mankind is Conditionally pardoned, and hath the gift of Life, enacted in the Law or Covenant of Grace, and all true Believers have by that Covenant actually given them a Right of Union with Chriſt, and with him Pardon and Adoption, or Right to Grace and Glory, and have the Spirit of Holineſs*

as

as the first fruits. All this is included in that Righteousness.

§ 12. Lastly, you ask, *What Righteousness Faith is imputed to? Whether that which is by Christs obedience, and by Faith, be the same? and perfect or unperfect?*

Ans. Here also you may take the blame that I say things long ago so oft said. By *Righteous* is meant *Justifiable* in general: And the plain meaning is, *Christ having merited, and freely given Pardon and Life to all sinners that will fiducially accept his purchased Gift, it is not now keeping the Law of Innocency or Works, but only the said fiducial Acceptance of Christ and his free Grace that is required on their part to their Right or Justification.* If by *Imputed* we meant, *Reputing it the MATTER of our total Righteousness*, then it were an unsound sense. But (briefly and plainly) Faith in Christ is reckoned to *us as the Matter of our imperfect personal subordinate Righteousness, and as the Instituted Medium of our Reception of our Union with Christ, and our Right to Pardon and Life for the Merit of his Righteousness.* And I think this is plain and full. For *Righteousness* to be *imputed*, is meant no more, but that *God accounteth the person Righteous:* But the *imputing Faith* to this, is but to reckon it to be what it is, 1. As the *Matter* of one; 2. As the *Medium* or Condition of the other.

§ 13. You here give me an *Epitome* of Dr. *John Owens Book of Justification*, which you judge *the best that you have seen*, and say it is faithfully

 collected,

collected, to save me the labour of reading it, to shew me how nearly we agree.

Ans. I have perused the Book. but being now absent from it, cannot judge whether you have rightly epitomized or recited it, and therefore shall speak to it as *yours*, and not as *his*: Thanking you for endeavouring to spare my labour, but not for calling me to judge of other mens Writings. Only I must say, I am glad of so much Moderation as is in it; but I better understand many other Books of Justification; especially Mr. *Truman*, Sir *Charles Wolsley*, Mr. *Gibbons* Sermon, Mr. *Wotton*, Mr. *Gataker*, a Manuscript of Dr. *Twisses* (though I agree not with him in his exclusion of Christs Active Righteousness as justifying us,) *Le Blank*, *Placæus*, yea *John Goodwin*, Mr. *Hotchkis*, and many others.

§ 14. You take *Imputing Righteousness to be the foundation of Reputing us righteous, and not the same thing.*

Ans. The Controversie is *de re*, or *de nomine*. *De re* we agree that a man must be *made Righteous* before he is *Reputed* so. *De nomine* I deny that St. *Paul* by *imputing* doth mean *making* us Righteous. Λογίζομαι, is by all confessed to signifie *Accounting*, *Reckoning* or *Reputing*: Making us Righteous goeth before *Reckoning it to us on account*. *John Goodwin* will tell you of many more senses of Imputation than you recite, and more considerable.

§. 15. II. You suppose an *Imputation of Righteousness to us, which was not ours before that Imputation*. *Ans.* Again *de re* there is a Donation of such: But *de nomine* I deny that this is it that the Scripture calleth Imputing. You

You make this to contain *two Acts*, and you Name *three*, 1. *A grant or Donation of the thing it self to be ours.* 2. A will of dealing *with us accordingly.* 3. *An actual so dealing with us.*

Anſ. 1. *De nomine*, I deny that λογίζομαι doth in Scripture ſignifie the *giving* of *Righteouſneſs* to him that had it not: but the *reckoning* it *on account* to him that by gift firſt had it. 2. Nor doth it primarily ſignifie *willing* to *uſe*, and *uſing* as righteous, but only by conſequence inferreth it.

But 2. *De re* here is no Explication how *Imputing is giving*, or *how Righteouſneſs is given us*: There is no queſtion but all the Righteouſneſs that we have is given us by God: But the very heart of the Controverſie is, *How the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is given us and made ours:* In that Righteouſneſs is found, 1. The *Matter*. 2. The *Form*. 1. The *matter* is, 1. The *Habits*. 2. *The Acts* of Chriſt in the Divine and Humane Nature: Are *theſe given us*, and do we poſſeſs them in themſelves? The *Acts* are *paſt*, and ſo are *nothing now:* and nothing is no bodies actual poſſeſſion. The *Acts* and *Habits* were *Accidents* which *ſine interitu* cannot paſs from Subject to Subject: Divers Subjects prove diverſity of Accidents. 2. The *Form* is a *Relation*, and ſo an Accident alſo: And they muſt needs be two Accidents, that are Formal Righteouſneſs in Chriſt and us, unleſs we are the ſame Subject Perſon. Therefore neither matter nor Relative form in Chriſt and Man is the ſame individual Accident. How then is it ours! What is there in it beſides matter (the ſubject and *fundamentum*) and form? It's plain that, 1. The *Benefits are given us*, and are *our own* by that *Gift*: All that conſiſt *in jure, in right*, (as

to Christ, to the Love of the reconciled Father, the Communion of the *Spirit*, to further Grace, Pardon, Glory) are all given us instrumentally by the new Covenants donative Act: The inherent habits, and the Acts are given us by the Holy Ghost. And 2. These Benefits being given us for the Sacrifice, and Merits of Christ, the *price* is said by a *Metonymy* of the *cause for the Effect*, to be *given us*, because it is *given for us*: It was *God the Father* to whom Christ paid the *price* of our Redemption, and gave his Active and Passive Righteousness for us: But *Morally* and *Reputatively* it is no unmeet phrase to say that is *given to us* which is *given for us* in our necessity and to purchase us all this.

If the King would ransom all his Subjects that are Slaves to the *Turks*, and paid a million for their Freedom, he may well be said to give them a million, though it be but a *Metonymical Speech*, seeing he gave it for them: Though it was the Freedom or Benefits and not the Money which indeed they received: And so it is here: So God giveth us Christs Righteousness, Merits and Satisfaction; but not properly the things themselves. If there be any more to be said as given us, I should have been glad to know what it is: but your Words shew it not.

Were it the very same Individual Righteousness that Christ hath, Acts, Habits and Formal Relation made in themselves our own accidents, it would follow that we are really perfect in Acts, Habits and Relation, and need neither more Pardon nor increase of Grace, nor should pray for any, nor use means for any, nor are we liable

able to any corrective Penalty, nor to any want of the Spirits help, but have present right to all that is due to a perfect righteous man; with much more such, which is all false.

Yet is it truly and fitly said that *Christ is our Righteousness*, that is, the purchaser and giver of it; and that he is *made of God to us Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification and Redemption*, on the same account: Yea though some deny it, his Righteousness may *be called the material cause* of our *Righteousness*, as ours is our *Jus ad impunitatem & vitam*, because it is the *matter* of it's *meritorious cause*. For if *Adam* had merited Life himself, his meritorious Acts and Habits would have been fitly called, the *matter of his Righteousness*, that is, of the *fundamentum Relationis*. Yet this is the difference: *Adams Right* or Relation of *Just*, would have resulted immediately from his own Acts and Habits compared with the Law; whereas ours resulteth from Christs *Merits* or *Righteousness*, not immediately as ours in it self, but mediately as paid for us to God, and the Benefit (of *Right* and *Righteousness*) given us by the Covenant, for the said Merit of our Mediator.

§ 16. Next you say, that this Imputation supposeth not the Person to have done and suffered himself what is imputed to him, and note their mistake that suppose the Doctrine of Imputation to imply that Christ did commit our Sins, and we perform his Righteousness.

Ans. This granteth much towards Concord: But I hope you understand that the Question is not whether *we* did *Physically do and suffer* what

what Christ did, even in our *Natural Persons?* but whether we did it *Morally, Legally, Civilly, Reputatively,* as a Man acteth by an *Instrument, Attorney, Vicar, or Personating Representer,* so that the Law reputeth it his Act. Why did you not note this, and tell us whether you deny this also, as well as our Physical performance? If you deny not this *our Legal or Moral doing and suffering* in and by Christ, you did not fairly in your Description of the Mind of your opposers, as far as ever I could understand them. But if you deny this, our agreement seemeth very feasible. But then you must go over the Explication of Imputation and Donation of Christs own Righteousness again, and better tell us what you mean by them, than these described words do.

§ 17. Next you tell us of Imputation, 1. *Ex "justitia.* 2. *Ex Voluntaria Sponsione.* 3. *Ex injuria.* "4. *Ex gratia.*

1. "Things imputed *ex justitia* you say are, 1. "For *Federal Relation,* as *Adams* sin. 2. *For* "*Natural Relation, and that only as to some temporal* "*Effects.*

Anſ. Here we must suppose by your former explication, that by *Imputation* you mean not *Estimative reckoning or accounting that to a man which he before hath, but,* 1. *Donation.* 2. *Usage congruously and will so to use one.* But *Adams* sin was *no gift* to us, and came not by donation; Nor is *Donation, Imputation.*

2. What you say of *Adams* sin being ours by *Covenant Relation,* as distinct from *Natural Relation,* is unsound, and the matter needeth fuller explication,

plication, which as aforesaid I have attempted in my *Disputation of Original Sin.* And as unsound is it that *Natural Relation* brings none but *Temporal Evil.* It cannot be proved, nor is to be affirmed, that *without natural derivation*, we derive by *meer Covenant* the guilt of *Adams* sin; no nor that *Covenant derivation* is before the *natural*, nor yet that it goeth *any further*, or that we contract any more guilt by Covenant, than we do by nature; but the Law of nature it self and Gods congruous Covenant is that which *virtually judgeth us guilty*, when natural derivation hath *made us guilty* (as Dr. *Twisse* oft as aforesaid.)

Do you mean that guilt resulteth from *Gods part of the Covenant*, or from *Adams*, or from *his Posterities?* Not from *ours*, for we *existed not*, and *made no such Covenant.* Not from *Adams* part (antecedent to *Natural Derivation.*) For 1. No man can prove that ever *Adam* made such *a Covenant.* 2. Or that God gave him any such *power*, (much less *Command*) to bring sin and death on his Posterity by his *Consent*, or *Will*, or *Contract*, further than by the *Law of Nature* they must derive it from him if he sinned. 3. Not by *Gods Covenant act*: For, 1. No such Covenant of God can be shewn, that made men sinners further than Natural Derivation did. 2. Else *God* should be the *Author of sin*, even of all *mens Original* sin, if his *Arbitrary Covenant* made them *sinners*, where *nature did not.*

Nay more, it is not meer *Natural Relation*, much less such *Covenant Relation* that doth it, (for *Relation* doth not so operate of itself) but it is that *Generation* which causeth *Fundamentally*

tally at once both the *Relation* of *Sons* and the *adherent guilt.*

And in my foresaid second Disputation I have proved that *Natural derivation* (even from nearer *Parents*) deserveth more than Temporal hurt.

§ 18. II. Your second *ex voluntaria Sponsione* you exemplify in *Onesimus* and *Judah* to *Jacob*, *Gen.* 43. 9.

Ans. 1. There is no talk of Imputation in either of the Texts, as to the receiver: Much less of an Imputation which is Donation. Indeed *Paul* undertaketh to pay *Onesimus*'s debt to *Philemon*; and so bids him set the debt on his account; that is, take him for the pay-master; If this be *Imputing the debt to Paul*, we are agreed that so (not our *reatus culpæ*, but *pœnæ*) *our debt* of *punishment* was *imputed to Christ*, that is, he undertook to bear it for us: *Paul* gave not the money *to Onesimus*, but *for him* (by promise.) He was not an *antecedent surety*, but a *consequent?* He did not promise to pay it in *Onesimus Legal person*; Nor is the payment properly *imputed to Onesimus* as any way done by him, but only the *Effected benefit* given him.

And *Judah* only undertaketh to bring *Benjamin* again, or else to bear the blame for ever. No doubt but Christ undertook our ransom, and also to effect our actual deliverance. If you will call this [*Giving or Imputing his own Righteousness to us, so as that* in se *it is made the same accident of every believer* besides giving them the benefits of that which he gave

gave to God for them, I will not imitate you.

III. That of *Bathsheba*, 1 *Kin.* 1. 21. taketh Imputation as the Scripture doth. For *accounting* and *reckoning* them to be sinners, and using them accordingly, and not as you do for *making* them such by making anothers Fact or guilt to become theirs. All these instances are for what I assert. None of them mention any such thing as imputing one mans Acts or Habits to another so as to *make* them or *repute* them to be really his.

IV. Your fourth sort of Imputation *ex meră gratiâ* you say is the *imputing of that which before that act we had no right to*: And you do well to say there is no other instance of it in Scripture: But you do not well to say without proof that *this is it that's meant*, *Rom.* 4. God *maketh us Righteous by donation* before he *imputeth it to us*: *Imputation* there is *Reckoning*, *Accounting*, and *Judging* a man to *be what he is*. Abraham *had Faith* before God *imputed Faith to him for Righteousness*: And that Faith was such *a Righteousness* as God *imputed it to be*. To say, it was an *imperfect one*, is no wonder: *Abraham* had none personally or properly *in se* but what was imperfect.

The sum of all our Controversie is, *what Righteousness believers have?* You before noted that Righteousness as it is a *conformity* to the *preceptive part of the Law*, is one thing, and as it relateth to the retributive part, and is our *Jus impunitatis & vitæ* it is another. The Doctrine which I bend all these words against is, that *we must have*, or *have*, *as our own any such righteous-*

righteousnes as is a conformity to the preceptive part of the Law of innocency, whether done by us or Christ. Prove that we have any such Righteousnes, and I yield all the cause to them that plead for the Imputation which I deny. If we have such a Righteousnes we have no sin, nor ever had, in the sense of the Law: And have no need of Christs Sacrifice, or are capable of pardon or punishment. I dare plead no Righteousnes as mine but [*subordinately as a condition* and *medium, my faith or performance* of the *conditions of the Covenant and its gifts, and principally my right to impunity and life for the sake of the Merits, Sacrifice and Intercession of Christ, freely given by him in the New Covenant.*] It was Christs perfect Righteousnes which meriteth mine, but I have no perfect Righteousnes of my own, either in me, or done by me, by my self or by my Instrument or Vicar, nor given to me, saving as metonymically, that is said to be given to me which was given for me, and the Effects or fruits of it given to me: Besides my imperfect Faith and sincere devotion to Christ, I know of no Righteousnes that I have, but that which saveth me from the Laws Condemnation, and giveth me right to life, which is not perfect obedience to the precept made mine, but pardon of disobedience, and a freely-given Adoption, merited by another whose merits were never mine so much as by proper gift or imputation, though figuratively they may be so called mine. I tire my self and you with tedious repetitions because I find that without them I am not understood.

Therefore your next inference that *Paul speaketh*

eth of that which was not ours before Imputation, is not true, as is proved.

And your second that the *imputation of Faith as a work, is not of Grace, is cloudy, or untrue, or both.* If by a work, you mean a work in Commutation obliging God, or any work which maketh the reward to be of debt and not of Grace, it's true that if faith were such a work it would be an act of Justice so to judge it. But Faith is no such work; and therefore it would be errour so to judge it. But if by a *work* you mean but a *Moral act*, as made by the Law of Grace the condition of pardon and life, then to Impute, Repute or Judge it to be *what it is so made*, is an act of *Truth* and *Justice*, but such Truth and Justice as is Evangelical, and consistent with Grace; and is founded on Grace: It is Grace, that we have a Saviour to purchase and give all: It is grace that we are not under the Law of Innocency which justifieth none but the innocent and perfect that never sinned: It is Grace that we have a Covenant and Law of Grace, which maketh sincere faith a Mediate or Subordinate Righteousness, requiring no more at our own hands instead of what the Law of innocency required: It is of Grace that as this faith is the matter of this subordinate Evangelical Righteousness, so it is the receptive *medium* of our right to Christ, pardon and life which is our full saving righteousness. It being therefore of Grace that it is made so, and also that we are made *believers*, it must be of *Grace*, though of *Truth and gracious Justice*, that it is *reckoned* or *imputed to us*, for *Righteousness*.

By *debt* opposed to *Grace*, *Paul* meaneth not, *Debitum*,

Debitum, *Duneſs*, by *free gift thankfully accepted*, but *quod debetur ex operis propriâ dignitate*, as a workman earneth his wages.

§ 19. Your Deſcription of the Imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs, is either to be underſtood as ſpoken in *proper words*, or as *figurative*. If the *latter*, it's *unintelligible* ſtill till explained: If the firſt, it is that ſame Doctrine which I take to ſubvert all the Goſpel; *viz.* "That [*God* "*maketh an effectual Grant and Donation of a true*, "*real, perfect Righteouſneſs, even that of Chriſt* "*himſelf, to all that believe, accounting it as* "*theirs.*]

God accounteth not Chriſts Divine Righteouſneſs to be *our Righteouſneſs*, nor yet his Humane Habitual Righteouſneſs, nor his Obedience to the Law proper to the Mediator, nor his Obedience to the Law of *Moſes* (which as ſuch bound not you or me,) nor his perfect fulfilling the Law of Innocency, nor his ſatisfactory Sacrifice for ſin, nor his Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, Interceſſion, *&c.* But he only accounteth theſe to be the *Cauſes* of our *Righteouſneſs*, and not our Righteouſneſs it ſelf. Though the Meritorious Cauſe may be called the Meritorious Matter in a remote ſenſe, as purchaſing the free Gift of our Formal Righteouſneſs.

Though this alſo is but an unneceſſary Logical name, the thing being without it plainlier opened, Relations having properly no Material Cauſe, and the Subject being it that is uſually ſo called; and our *Jus* being our Formal Righteouſneſs, and the Covenant Donation the *Fundamentum Juris*, and Chriſts Meritorious Righteouſneſs

teousneſs being but the cauſe of that *Fundamentum* or *Titulus*, it can be called the *Matter* of our *Right* but in a remote ſenſe, and ſuch a Matter as is *without us*, *paid for us*, but not *ours in it ſelf*, but the *CAUSE* of that *Relation* which is *ours*.

The plain inconſiſtency of a *Perfect Conformity to the Law made our own*, with *Chriſts dying for ſin*, and our need *of pardon*, *conſtrained* a great part of the famouſeſt Divines of the laſt Age, to go too far, in my Judgment, in excluding Chriſts Active, and Habitual Righteouſneſs, to our Juſtification, and confining it to the Paſſive only: Such as *Olevian*, *Urſine*, *Piſcator*, *Paræus*, *Scultetus*, *Wendeline*, *Beckman*, and others in *Germany*; and *Camero*, with his moſt Judicious and Learned followers in *France*; and Dr. *Twiſſe* (whoſe *M. S.* I before mentioned) Mr. *Wotton*, Mr. *Gataker* and others in *England*: And yet the two laſt, I think, go not ſo far as the reſt. But Mr. *Bradſhaw* truly told them, that it is not the excluding the Active from Imputation that muſt untie the knot, but the taking Imputation it ſelf in a ſound ſenſe, and forſaking the unſound rigid notion of it, both as to the Active and Paſſive Righteouſneſs. *Grotius de Satisfactione* hath gone the middle way, and if that Book had been more ſtudied, fewer would have made us a new Goſpel in terms, who, I hope, in ſenſe do mean better than they ſpeak.

§ 20. In your explication you further own the ſubverting ſenſe; *viz.* "That *Chriſts perfect* "*Righteouſneſs is made the Righteouſneſs of Belie-* "*vers* (forma dat nomen) *and is accordingly*

"*judged*

"*judged, esteemed and reputed theirs, being by free* "*Gift made theirs to all ends and purposes, where-* "*to it would have served, if it had been their own,* "*without any such Imputation, Donation or Com-* "*munication, and God dealeth with them accord-* "*ingly.*]

Ans. This is plainer dealing than we had before. If this were true,

1. We are as righteous as Christ.

2. We may deny that ever we were sinners; for had we done all this our selves, that is, kept the Law perfectly from first to last, we had never sinned.

3. We had never deserved punishment;

4. Nor needed a Sacrifice;

5. Or a Pardon;

6. Nor should we, during the time of our unregeneracy, have been left under spiritual death, or at least, after believing, be left under remaining sin, and a body of death;

7. Nor have been penally deprived of any help of the Spirit;

8. Nor of any Communion with God;

9. Nor so long be kept out of Heaven, or the Reward;

10. Nor ever have been corrected;

11. Nor ever had need of Word, Prayer or Sacraments for the helping us to renewed Pardon;

12. Nor ever have died and rotted in a grave;

13. Nor would the Magistrates Execution of Justice on us for our crimes be owned as Gods Justice.

14. All men would have the same degree of Innocency and Holiness.

15. It

15. It would have been a wrong to us, when we had perfectly kept the Law of Innocency, to suspend our right to Pardon and Salvation upon new Conditions in a new Covenant.

16. We having perfectly kept the Law of Innocency as to the death, as soon as we believe, cannot be under another Law of the Redeemer that hath the true uses of a Law.

17. Our own actions (besides Christs) are not capable of Reward or Punishment.

18. All the Texts of Scripture that mention inherent or practical personal Righteousness, would contradict our imputed Righteousness, or make us supererogate, and be more than perfectly righteous.

19. We need not fear that any new crime should diminish our Righteousness which is perfect, and can neither increase or decrease.

20. Whether we should not be as righteous on Earth (even under *Davids* or *Peters* sin) as in Heaven? and whether we should be Deified by being divinely righteous, and justified by Gods Essential Righteousness, as *Andr. Ostander* taught, I leave to be considered, as you further explain your self.

So much to your Epitome, which if I wrong you by judging it all your own, it is long of your self that own it as aforesaid in the gross: If the Dr. be wronged, it is by you, and not by me.

§ 21. In the conclusion you do no more peaceably than provedly pronounce us in a manner agreed, enumerating the particulars in which we consent: But I have told you wherein we are not agreed in words, nor in sense, if those words be not mis-used, whatever we are in latent sense.

I still grant that Christ suffered, yea and obeyed, in some sort, in our stead, though not in our person, Civil, or Legal, so as that we are Legally reputed the doers of it by or in him: And that his assuming our Nature, and being the second *Adam*, a voluntary Sponsor and Mediator, was a necessary reason of the application of the fruits to us; and that we are as certainly and happily justified and glorified, as if we had been the doers and satisfiers our selves (so many as are saved;) But not on the same reasons, nor in the same method or manner of conveyance: Nor when in judgment we are accused as having sinned and deserved death, can we deny it, & plead that we were innocent by another, or by imputation, as we should have been, had we been innocent our selves: But we must plead pardon, and a free gift of life, through the merits, satisfaction and intercession of a Saviour.

§ 21. And to all before said, I may add, That they who account all the *Laws obligations* on each person to be *fulfilled* by Christ, (and not only satisfaction given for our not fulfilling them, 1. Must suppose that *one person* of Christ to have been Legally *as many persons* as he died for (or justifieth:) For the *Law* laid as many *distinct obligations on them*, as they were *persons*, and laid them *only on their persons*. It said, *Thou* Adam, *Thou* Eve, *shalt personally obey perfectly, or die*: And the Law of Nature, and of *Moses* said in sense, Thou *Solomon*, Thou *Manasses*, (and so of all others) shalt do all things commanded, and not sin: Now that in all Christs Obedience he was Legally and imputatively so many several persons, *Adam*, *Eve*, *Solomon*, *Manasseh*, and so that none of these broke Gods Law, I find

not

not in the Scripture. If you say, *Adam was Legally as many persons* as are born of him in sin, I deny it: He was the Root of all his Posterity, and they were in him seminally and virtually, but not *personally*, *actually*, or imputatively: But by one mans disobedience, as their Root and Cause, many are made sinners: And by one mans obedience, as the Root and Cause, all Believers are made righteous. It is enough that one Saviour and Mediator in a third person of his own *did* and *suffered* that which by its *merits* and *value* (as attaining the Ends of the Law and Government) procured our deliverance from a necessity of perfect obeying as the Condition of Life, and from guilt and misery, and is become the Root, Head and Donor of Grace and Glory.

2. And if (as you say) it be the very *thing* that is imputed to us as ours, to all *intents*, as if we had done it, why have you not told us, whether it be *all that Christ did*, or but *some?* and *what?* and *how* from Scripture you prove the distribution? and whether we have not thus, a Righteousness, which is both *too much*, and *too little*.

I. *Too much:* For *we* were not obliged by the Law to be *born of a Virgin*, by the *Holy Ghost*, to *fast forty days*, to turn *Water into Wine*, to *cast out Devils*, to *heal all diseases*, and *raise the dead*, to *indite the Gospel*, and *send out Apostles*, *&c.* If you say that so much only of Christs Obedience is in *it self our own*, as we must else have done our selves, I ask the proof of the limitation.

And II. Is it not then *too little*, if it must be the *Idem*, and not the *Æquivalens?* For some of us are bound to the Offices of *Parents*, and some of *Husbands* and *Wives*, some of *Servants*, some of *Magistrates*

strates, some of *Souldiers*, some to actions proper to the *sick*, to the *old*, and other conditions which Christ was never in: We are bound to *mortifie our sinful lusts*, to *pray for pardon and grace*, to *receive a pardon offered*, to *yield to the mortifying motions of the Spirit*, &c. which Christ was not capable of. It was enough that he undertook all that was fit for him, and necessary by equivalency to satisfie, and merit a free gift of grace and glory for us, and that he performed the undertaken conditions and duties of all that Law which was laid on him; without doing all the same things which were laid on us.

§. 22. And one thing more I desire you to note, which *Grotius de satisf.* hath minded us of, *viz.* The great difference that there is between the case of a *Rector* and a *Creditor*, and between a *Subject* and a *Debtor*, or a Debt of *Obedience* or *Punishment* and a Debt of *Money*: For the name of *Debt* occasioneth some men to run the similitude of a *Creditor* and *Debtor* beyond the bounds. The Law requireth not a *Debitor pecuniæ*, 1. To pay the very *same individual money* which he borrowed, but the *same sum*. 2. Nor to pay it by his *own hands*. But the Law of God obligeth every Subject to every individual act which it commandeth. 2. And obligeth every man to do it all in his *own person* and not disjunctively by himself or a Vicar. That Christ is *limitedly* and *only to certain ends and uses* a *Vicarius pœnæ* in the person of a *Mediator*, is not because the *Law* as made to *Adam* required or accepted it, but the *Lawgiver* as *above his Law*. The Law that *bound Christ* is *fulfilled*; but the Law that *bound Adam* and every man

man is *not fulfilled* unleſs that ſame man do himſelf all the ſame things which it commanded him.

§ 23. I conclude all with theſe profeſſions of my opinion of all theſe Controverſies.

I. I believe that the Libertines (commonly called Antinomians) whoſe Doctrines I have in many Books oppoſed, do uſe thoſe ill Notions, and Methods which on pretence of magnifying Chriſt and free grace, do by plain conſequence wrong Chriſt and Grace, and *Subvert the Goſpel*, and ſhould rather be *thence* denominated, than from their *denying the Law*. (The Law of *Innocency* as a *Covenant*, and of *Moſes* as Jewiſh being truly ceaſed.)

II. I believe that yet moſt of thoſe that thus err in notions, are not ſo bad in their *Judgment* of the *matter it ſelf* as their *words import*; but that want of *Skill in Terms* and *Method* hath ſeduced men of dull wits, ſlight popular ſtudies, and undigeſted thoughts, to ſpeak worſe than they think, and had they more exact diſtinguiſhing and expreſſive Skill, they would ſhew that they mean moſtly as others do.

III. I believe that unskilful contending with the Papiſts hath occaſioned all this, while in the heats of Controverſy men bend all their wits to diſgrace the Doctrine of their adverſaries, not fearing enough unſafe expreſſions and contrary extreams while they ſeem to ſerve their preſent turn: And then departing from Scripture terms as neceſſary to ſet their hearers far enough from their adverſaries, are next carried into a multitude of new made articles or notions, contrary alſo to Scripture *ſenſe*, when they have once thus left the words.

IV. I believe that moſt honeſt, plain, leſs learned Chriſtians, and the throughly ſtudied and learned Teachers

Teachers, agree in the true sence of the Doctrine of Justification which the *half studied* contenders make to seem more difficult than it is, and muddy it by their unlearned questions and words. That is, all plain Christians hold, that [*Christ God and Man is our only Saviour who obeyed, suffered and interceedeth for us, as a Mediator, and is become as redeemer the Lord of all, even of Nature, Grace and Glory, and hath merited, purchased and made a Covenant and Law of Grace, that whoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life; offering his Grace to all, and effectually giving it to some;* And that as our King and Lord *Redeemer he governeth us by this Law, and requireth Faith and Repentance of all that will be pardoned, and sincere obedience to the end, of all that will be glorified; and as he pardoneth all past sin at our Conversion, so to those that believe and sincerely obey him, he pardoneth all their following sins; and as he maketh them righteous by giving them his Spirit to perform the conditions of pardon, adoption and Salvation, and by forgiving all their sins, and freely giving them right to life Eternal, for the sake of his Sacrifice and Merits, so he accordingly virtually justifieth them by his Covenant, and so esteemeth them, and will so use them, and will so judge them finally by his Sentence hereafter, and will receive them as so justified and adopted to his Glory.*]

This all agree in till wranglers trouble them; and this much is enough.

FINIS.

A

Defence of Christ,

AND

Free Grace:

Against the

SUBVERTERS,

Commonly Called,

Antinomians or *Libertines*;

WHO

Ignorantly Blaſpheme CHRIST on Pretence of extolling Him.

IN A

DIALOGUE

Between

An Orthodox Zealot,

AND

A Reconciling Monitor.

WRITTEN

On the occaſion of the reviving of thoſe Errours, and the Reprinting and Reception of Dr. *Criſpes* Writings, and the danger of ſubverting many Thouſand honeſt Souls by the Notions of *Free Grace*, and Juſtification, miſ-underſtood and abuſed by injudicious, unſtudyed, prejudiced Preachers.

By RICHARD BAXTER.

London, Printed for *Tho. Parkhurſt* at the *Bible* and *Three Crowns*, at the lower End of *Cheapſide*, near *Mercers-Chapel*, 1690.

TO THE READER.

A *POSTSCRIPT* to the Second Book.

SInce the Writing of all that followeth, I have seen the New Edition of Dr. Crisp's *Sermons: There are prefixed to it, twelve Reverend Names, Mr.* Griffiths, *Mr.* Cockains, *Mr.* Chancys, *Mr.* Howes, *Mr.* Alsops, *Mr.* Nat. Mather, *Mr.* Increase Mather, *Mr.* Knowles, *Mr.* Powels, *Mr.* Turners, *Mr.* Bures, *& Mr.* Gammons. *The Preface is Mr.* S. Crispes *invective against me, unnamed, with the Citation of some Preachers Words as contrary to mine.*

I must desire those Conformists *that will write the next friendly debate, and will charge Heresy on the* Non-Conformists, *that they will lay the charge on none, but the guilty; and that they take not all whose Names are prefixed to be of the judgment of Dr.* Crispe (*a Conformist*): *For I am past doubt, that Four or Five of them are against it. If you ask, why then did they give their Names to be hanged up like a Sign before the Door of a House of Seduction, it's like they have something more to say*

for it than I know of: But their Words shew you that they only testifie the Sermons to be the Drs. own. They are men of Peace, and inclined to gratifie others in attesting a truth, and I suppose, intended not to promote untruth by it.

But I see the corrupting Design is of late, grown so high, that what seemed these Thirty Four Years suppressed, now threatneth as a torrent to overthrow the Gospel, and Christian Faith, and to deny the true Office of Christ as Mediator and his Grace and Righteousness, by seeming ignorantly to extol them: And Satan designeth to make us a common scorn to Papists and Malignants, by the palpable grosness of such mens undeniable Errours. And therefore I dare neither give them my Name, nor be silent in such a common scandal and danger, while I can speak and write.

It offendeth me that I must but briefly name their errours, instead of a large confutation of them, while the whole Scripture is against them; but I have done it oft largely, which they will not answer. And the Booksellers *will Print no Books that are large and insensible of our danger, think they are but few that need it.*

One errour the Preface addeth to the hundred, which were it a truth, would carry the cause for them, and bring me to a recantation, viz. That Christ and the Elect are one and the same Person. *It is not a Relative personality that is the question; for so Christ himself had many Persons, as one and the same man may have the Person of a Father, of a Husband, of a Master, of a King,* &c. *But it is Physical or Substantial Personality, which Mr.* Crispe *saith, is more than natural, we being one Spirit, and Bone of his Bone, and Flesh of his Flesh. And if this be so, I shall grant that we are as righteous as Christ, and Christ now in Heaven (and not*

not on the Cross only) *is guilty of all our sins, and was indeed as they call him, the greatest blasphemer, hater of God, adulterer,* &c. *in the World.*

But 1. *If all the Elect be really many distinct Persons, then, either Christ must be also as many distinct Persons, or not be the same Person with them all, or any of them. But the Elect are many distinct Persons, and shall be so for ever:* Peter *was not* Paul *or* John: *They do not the same Acts: They be not guilty of the same numerical sins: Every man shall answer for all that he hath done in the Body, and not for all that all others of the Elect have done. All the Elect shall not sit on the twelve Thrones, as Apostles: All did not Preach the Gospel as* Paul *did, nor Persecute as* Paul *did: Overthrow distinct individuation here or in Heaven, and how dismal will be the consequence? And here, will not each man have right to anothers House, Wife, Food, Goods, if they are but one Person?*

To be one in Spirit, is no more to be one Person, *than seeing by the same Sun-light maketh all Eyes to be one Eye. For the Spirit is not our personality.*

And if you make Christ to be many Millions of Persons, where is his Unity in himself, or with any.

2. *If Christ and the Elect, be all one, and the same Person, then the Elect are really God himself: For the Person of Christ, is God: These men are unfit to confute the Schools who have long maintained that the very human nature of Christ, is not a part of his Person, but an accident of it; because he is but one Person, which is the second in Trinity from Eternity, and is God (of which see* Derodon de Supposito.) *And if we are all one God, then God suffers when we suffer, and God judgeth himself when he judgeth us: May not Men pray to such then, and Worship them as Gods, and Trust in them*

as Gods? Is not this Idolatry worse than Image-Worship, or than Anti-christianity?

3. *If Christ and the Elect be one and the same Person, then Christ sinneth when ever they sin: And Christ suffered for his own sin, even that which he by them committed: And then he pardoneth his own sin; (or who pardoneth him)? But all this is false.*

4. *And it would follow, that all the Elect are Mediators to themselves, and dyed for their own sins, and pardon their own sins, and justify themselves, and believe in themselves, and save themselves.*

5. *And are all Christ's threatnings against himself, which are against us? Doth Satan overcome him, when ever he overcometh us? Is his Law made for himself, that is made for us? Doth he command a Father to correct Christ, when he commandeth him to correct his Children? Doth the Magistrate hang Christ when he hangeth a Malefactor, tho' Elect, (that sinneth by surprize.)*

6. *Where there are divers Bodies, and divers Souls, and divers Understandings, and divers Wills, there are divers Persons: But of all these, in Christ and us there is a diversity.*

I believe that the Union between Christ and the Glorified, will be neerer than we can well now conceive: But not such as will make us one and the same Person with Christ. I have read in Phanatick Fryers, such as Barbanson, *and* Benedictus de Benedictis, *and in* Gibienf *the* Oratorian, *of our Deification, and being Goded with God, and that it is the only perfection to know no being but God: And I have read of such Heathen as Worshipped Demon-Gods, that once were men. And it is the top of the now prevalent Bruitism, or Sadducism, to believe that all Souls are but one God, and as Candles that are individuate by the Oily Matter, when extinct, are all*

one

one in the common Air; and that there is nothing but God and Matter. But I hope few good Christians will so far lose the knowledge of themselves, as to take themselves to be the same Person with him that is God: Angels forbad John *to Worship them, tho' he took them not for God. Do those Churches exercise Discipline upon such as are one Person with Christ? Do they Excommunicate Christ for sin? No wonder that Dr.* Crispe *chargeth* David *as speaking untruth, for complaining of his sin, and Gods displeasure; tho'* John *says, He is a Lyar that saith he hath no sin, and all God's Saints have profess'd Repentance; but I read not that Christ did ever Repent of sin.*

I doubt some will think that I feign Mr. Crispe *to say what he doth not, his words are these:*

First, He accuseth me as saying [To say our Union with Christ so makes us Flesh of his Flesh, that we are the same *PERSON* with Christ; this is so gross, that I will not bestow time to confute it.] *He answers* [" Nor cannot as long " as that Text is in our Bibles; we are Mem- " bers of his Body, of his Flesh, and of his Bones, " *Ephes.* 5—— *God saith,* He that is joyned to " the Lord, is one Spirit; which is more than a " Political Member, or a Natural Member either.] *I believe that it is more than Political, but not such as maketh us one* Person *with Christ.* Andrew Osiander, *is condemned by Protestants for feigning that the Essence of God is our Righteousness.* Nestorius *was condemned by General Councils, as supposed to feign Christ to have two Persons: What would these Councils have judged of them that feign him to have Million of Persons, or Millions, to be all one Person with him?*

As to Mr. Crispes *Epistle, it calleth more for Pitty, than Confutation: He pretendeth out of his Notes, to tell what I Preached at* Pinners-Hall, Jan. 17. 1673. *and* Aug. 11. 1674. *(so long since.) And he begins with a gross untruth, that I said,* [" A " mans first believing is by external Arguments, " not by the Operation of the Spirit, but his after- " believing is by the Spirit.] *I do not believe that the man purposed to lye, but trusted his false Ears, and Notes. The World knoweth how voluminously I have written to the contrary: Never such an Opinion came into my head: But contrarily I have copiously proved, that even common Faith, much more the first justifying Faith, is the work of Gods Spirit: : My* Catholick Theology, *proveth it all at large. I doubt not but both first and second Faith is by Scripture Argument; but never dream'd that it was not the Work of the Spirit: Indeed I find few of his accusing Notes, that be not falsifications by his defective or patcht Recital.*

I am sorry that he hath wronged the Memory of such good men as Mr. Fowler, *and Mr.* Cole, *by telling the World how unstudied, and yet how confident they have been in some points. But he did worse in citing Dr* Manton, *that incurr'd their Censure for defending me in that very Pulpit, where he saith I Preach'd against such accusers as he; and was wholly of my judgment. And reciting Arch-Bishop* Usher, *who perused my* Confession *written against the* Antinomians, *and altered not a word in it, before I published it; I got him and Mr.* Gataker *to read it (and it was the last Work that Mr.* Gataker *did in the World, as his Epistle and his Sons shew.)*

Had the Prefacer read but that one Book, my Confession, *written in* 1655. *and there the explications of*

of the Controversies, and the many score plain Texts and Arguments, and the hundred Testimonies of Synod, and Protestant Divines, for the Doctrine which I defend; and specially if he have read my Explication of all these Controversies, in my Catholick Theology, *and* Methodus, *and* Dispute *of* Justification, *and of* Justifying Righteousness; *and yet had call'd for an answer to Mr.* Cole *or Mr.* Fowler, *I should have told him that he, and such as he, are too hard or deaf for me to answer.*

But he impertinently citeth other men, that say, we are justified by Free Grace, and the Righteousness of Christ, and not by Works; as if he would falsly intimate that I deny it, when I neither trust to, nor know any Righteousness that is not meerly subordinate to the Righteousness of Christ; and take his Righteousness Habitual, Active and Passive, to be the only and perfect Meritorious Cause of our Justification, and Salvation of Grace and Glory: And I wonder not, that Paul *counted his own Righteousness by the Law to be dung in comparison of being found in Christ, having his Righteousness. But I abhor the opinion, that Christ's Righteousness given us, is all without us, and none within us, when Christ dwelleth in us; as if* 600 *Texts of Scripture were all false, that speak of the necessity of an inherent and active Righteousness. I abhor the opinion of any works necessary to Justification or Salvation, or to any common Blessings in the sense of* Paul; *such as make the reward to be of Debt, and not of Grace. I think few men living, are less tempted to magnify or trust to any worth of their own, than I am. I look not for a bit of Bread, or an hours Ease, or Life, or the Pardon, or Acceptance of one Duty, or of my Holiest Affections (so faulty are they by their great Imperfection) but meerly from the Free Grace of God,*

God, and the Merits and Intercession of Christ. But should I take all for Errour that this Preface reciteth as such, and all for truth that Dr. Crispe *and such men write; I should look for wiser men than him or Mr.* Cole, *to Anathematize me, rather as an Anti-Gospeller, than a meer* Antinomian. *And I am the sorryer for the prefixing of the Twelve Reverend Names, when I find by their Epistles that they had read this Preface, so full of false Citations and gross Errour, and say not a word against it, nor against such a Book.*

Mr. Cockain, *in his Epistle, directing it to them* that live Godly in Christ Jesus, *tells them,* that the Kingdom of God within them, shall never be shaken; and the Divine Nature that hath swallowed them up, shall for ever satisfy them with variety of Contentments. *And is not that ours which is within us? And is this Kingdom and Divine Nature, nothing but that which Christ did without us, imputed to be done by us? And if this be no subordinate Righteousness, what doth the word signify so many hundred times used in the Scripture?*

Let them but grant Justification by Faith, and let them assign Faith what Office therein they can reasonably imagine, without flat denying all Pauls *Doctrine, and they will confute Dr.* Crispe. *Say but that Faith is imputed to us for Righteousness, and give not the lye to* Paul, *and sure we shall be reconciled. But if they will tell us that by* Faith, *Paul meaneth not Faith, but Christ's Righteousness; they must prove that they have more than a Papal Power to make God's Word, by making the Sense, when God maketh but the Letter, before we can renounce the Scripture and believe them. And yet, if they will expound Imputation soberly, we shall grant them the matter (that Christ's Righteousness is accounted to us*

of God, as the only Meritorious Cause of our Justification and Salvation) *tho' we believe that by* Faith, Paul *meaneth* Faith.

But if they still say, that by Faith is meant only the Object of Faith, and not the Act; *could we but get them to forbear Anathematizing Men for being so Learned, as to understand English, we might yet hope at least, to keep the flame of their Zeal out of the thatch within the Chimney; by telling them the difference between the* Object of Faith, *as* such, *and the person that is the Object, otherwise considered. In* real Existence, *Christ, tho' not yet believed in, is the sole meritorious Cause: But it is only in* esse cognito, *that Christ is the Object of Faith. And School-Boyes that have no damnable Learning, may teach these confident men, that the* Object *as an* Object believed, *is the very form in* specie *of the Act of Faith: It is an Act without it, but not* this Act, *viz. the Christian Faith. As sin in* esse reali *is damning, but in* esse cognito objectivo, *it is the form of the Grace of Repentance; so is it here. But if they will grant that by* Faith *is meant* Faith, *and not say that* Paul *condemneth Justification by Faith, as being but Justification by Works; let them but tell us, how it justificth: I say not efficiently at all; but only as a meer receptive qualification: If they say as an* Efficient Instrument, *they give it much more than I do; and lay it on the Act or the* τὸ Credere, *as they speak: For, what else is the Instrument; I hope they mean not that Christ and his Righteousness is but the Instrument: But of this, more after.*

I thought it meet to have recited many hundred Texts of Scripture, which they directly contradict, which good Men should rather believe than them: But if the Reader will peruse my Confession, *he will find it there done already. And*

And I thought it neceſſary to commend the good Lives of many of them (excepting the Schiſm and Unrighteouſneſs that Faction doth involve them in) leſt the Groſneſs of their Verbal Errours, which come from unskilfulneſs in Words and Methods, ſhould tempt many to judge of the Men by their Words, and Opinions; and ſhould harden the malignant to juſtifie all their hard Cenſures and Uſage of the Non-Conformiſts *for their ſakes. And yet Mr.* Criſpe *is one of my ſharp Cenſurers, for charitably excuſing Men from leſſer Errours than his own (while he falſifyeth my Words about our difference with the* Papiſts.)

I have ſaid oft, and long agoe, that I cannot be ſo harden'd againſt God's *miraculous Judgments in* New-England, *on Mrs.* Hutchiſon *and Mrs.* Dyer, *and the Caſe of their Governour, and Mr.* Wheeler, *recited by Mr.* Weld, *in his Book, called,* The Riſe and Fall of *Antinomianiſme* in New-England, *as to deſpiſe thoſe with the Scripture, to hear* Satan *ſeeming an Angel of Light or Righteouſneſs. I once more counſel them that are prejudic'd againſt my Writings, to read Mr.* Bradſhaw (*an* Independant) *of* Juſtification, *Mr.* Truman's Grand Propitiation, Ant. Watton de Reconciliatione, *Mr.* Gataker *againſt* Saltmarſh, *and on* Lucius *and* Piſcator. Ben. Woodbridge (*the firſt Graduate of the* New-England Colledge,) *Mr.* Thomas Warren, *Mr.* Hotchkins, *Mr.* Gibbons *of* Black-Fryers, *his* Lecture *at* Giles, Placeus in Theſ. Salmurienſ. Teſtardus, Codurcus; *but above all*, Vinc. le Blancks Theſes; *and the* Breme Divines, S. Charles Wolſley *of* Juſtification, *and the foreſaid Book of Mr.* Weld *a* New-England *Congregational-man: The Subject of which, I ſuppoſe two or three of the Twelve Epiſtlers (the two Mr.* Mathers, *if not Mr.* Chancy *alſo) will give you a truer Account of, than Dr.* Stubs

Stubs (*a man miserable in life and death*) *did do.*

Once more I conculde, that if Christ was one Person with the Elect, before they were men, he was one Person with those that were no Persons: If he were one Person with them, before their Conversion, he was one Person with Millions of wicked men, and slaves of the Devil, and the haters, and persecutors of Himself, and of Holiness. And seeing they hold that this Union is not dissolvable, do they not feign him now in Heaven to be one Person with all the Elect wicked sinners on Earth?

I still say, I will not lose my Charity as to the Persons of these blind Zealots, and unskilful Talkers: But how conscionably soever they live, it is no thanks to their ungodly unchristian Doctrine. If they prevail to make England *believe that elect wicked Infidels are as righteous as* Christ; *and that it is impossible that any sin should hurt them, or that any Prayer or Duty should do them any good, (the expres's Words of Dr.* Crisp*) and that to intend their own good by any, is to wrong the* Free Grace *and full salvation by* Christ *(with the rest like this): I should have more hope of the* Turks *and* Heathens, *than of that Land that receiveth and practiseth these Principles, notwithstanding Mr.* Cokain's *Benediction to those that practise what this Doctor taught.*

The God of Truth and Mercy, save a poor Nation from the extream Factions that run deeper daily into the guilt of Impenitency and doleful Divisions; and let not sober Peace-makers mourn in despair, over a hopeless Generation of self-destroyers, as having laboured for Peace in vain.

Jan. 15. $16\frac{82}{90}$

A further Advertisement to the READER.

HE *that will know whether I rightly cite* Dr. Crispe, *must read his own Books, especially,* Lib. 2. Serm. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. 15. *and* Vol. 1. Serm. 9, 10, 11. *He is so large, that I must give you but a Taste of his Doctrine, in his own Words.*

Vol. 2. Serm. 3. pag. (Edit. 1644.) 88, 89, 90. *It is Iniquity it self that the Lord hath laid on* Christ.—— *It is the Fault or Transgression it self* —— *To speak it more plainly, Hast thou been an Idolater, a Blaphemer, a Despiser of* God's *Word, a Trampler on Him? Hast thou been a Despiser of Government, a Despiser of thy Parents, a Murtherer, an Adulterer, a Thief, a Lyar, a Drunkard? Reckon up what thou canst against thy self, if thou hast Part in the* Lord Christ, *all these Transgressions of thine become actually the Transgressions of* Christ, *and so cease to be thine, and thou ceasest to be a Transgressor, from that time they were laid on* Christ, (which he oft saith, was before we were born) *to the last hour of thy Life: So that now thou art not an Idolater, thou art not a Persecutor, a Thief, or a Murtherer,* (Why will not our Judges believe this, but hang innocent Men?) *Thou art not an Adulterer, thou art not a sinful Person,* (Why did Christ then justifie the confessing Publican?) *Reckon what Sin soever you commit, when you have part in* Christ, *you* ARE ALL *that* Christ *was,* Christ *is* ALL *that you were,* 2 Cor. 5. 21. *mark it well:* Christ *is not himself so compleatly righteous, but we are as righteous as he was: Nor we so compleatly sinful, but* Christ *became, being made sin, as compleatly sinful as we:*

Nay,

Nay, more; The righteousness that Christ *hath with the Father, we* ARE *the same righteousness; that very sinfulness that we were,* Christ *is made that very sinfulness before* God; *so that here is a direct Change:* Christ *takes our* PERSONS, *and Conditions, and stands in our stead; we take* Christ's PERSON *and Condition, and stand in his stead: What the Lord beheld* Christ *to be, that he beheld his Members to be; and what he beheld the Members to be in themselves, that he beheld* Christ *himself to be.*——Christ *himself is not more righteous, than this Person; and that Person is not more sinful than* Christ *was.*

Pag. 91, *&c. He at large striveth to prove that it was not only the guilt of sin, or the Punishment that* God *put on* Christ, *but the very sin it self. So* p. 108. (Having well proved, that Imputation signifieth not, *That* God *lyed, or* mis-reckoned, *but* only reckoned *that to* be, which truly is: *He saith,* [That *Christ* became as really and truly the Person that had all these sins, as he that did commit them really and truly, had them:] *Read more,* Serm. 6. pag. 139. *There is not one Passage of Scripture that speaks of imputing our sins to* Christ.

Vol. 1. Serm. 10. pag. 242. *For* ANY HURT *that such sins can do to us, it is not possible; for* Christ *hath made satisfaction.* pag. 239. *Tho' sins be committed, there is no peace broken, because the breach of peace is satisfied in* Christ. p. 234, 235. *That they are to do, they are not to do it with* ANY EYE *to their own Advantage, that being already perfectly compleated to their hands, before they do any thing: But with an Eye to glorifie God, and to serve their Generation. And* page. 236, 237. *he is large in threatning them that pray or do any thing for Life, or furthering our Salvation,*

tion; Do this, and live; *being the Voice of the Law, therefore we must do nothing that we may live, (or as elsewhere he saith) to be ever the better for it.*

P. 230, 231. *There is not any Duty you perform, when you have attained the highest pitch, that hath any prevalency or availableness, to produce to bring forth any the least Good to your selves: I say again, There is nothing you can do, from whence you ought to expect any Gain to your selves by doing; you ought not to seek to find in what you do,* &c.—*No Believer for whom* Christ *dyed, should have the least Thought in his heart, of promoting or advanceing himself, or any end of his own, by doing what he doth, but to glorifie* God, *and do good to men.*

You cannot propound or intend to your selves any possible Gain by Duty, &c. Why then do men plow, and sow, and trade, and eat, *&c.* Is it not as much against *Christ* to do good for others, as for my self? Is glorifying God inconsistent with seeking to be saved?

Reader, I give thee but this Taste, to shew thee how truly I cite him in all the rest. I have Five Arguments against these Men. 1. *The Essential Nature of Man.* 2. *The Nature of* God, *and his Government.* 3. *The Office and Work of* Christ, *and Grace.* 4. *The whole Bible.* 5. *The Consent of Mankind, especially Christians.*

The dismal Effects: 1. *The confirming of Thousands in* Popery, *seeing our horrid* Errors. 2. *Hardening Malignants in* Impenitency, *as being but against odious* Hereticks. 3. *Seducing ignorant Zealots, cheated by good Words and Names.* 4. *Threatening the Land with uncurable Division.* 5. *Disaffecting Rulers against us as intollerable.*

To

To the *TEACHERS* of Dr. *Crispe*'s Doctrine.

THE laudable Conversations of many of you, shew, that you are not wholly void of Religion: But it's no thanks to your irreligious Doctrine. It is no wonder that such men would cast out Reason from Religion; for their Religion seemeth to be by meer instinct: But if it must be without Reason, it is hard that they will make it all against Reason. While Reason is essential to man, no wonder then if Religion meet with much Resistance; and if, as one of Mr. Crispe's *Authors saith,* (nigro Carbone notandus) That to cause one to believe in *Christ*, be as great a Miracle as *Christ*'s Resurrection, and as great an Instance of Almightiness, as any Work that God hath made: *No doubt, but it is a hard, and great, and special Work, and an effect of Omnipotency, or else it were no effect of God: For,* omnis potentia est Dei est Omnipotentia. *A Hand or tongue moveth not but by Omnipotency; but all that God doth, are not equal Instances or Demonstrations of Omnipotency; nor are they all Miracles, and as great Miracles as the Resurrection of* Christ. *Is not the Preaching of the Gospel a means of mens believing? And is that as great a Miracle as* Christ's *Resurrection, that is wrought by so rational a means, used by man? I am sure St.* Paul *used not so much to prove the Truth of Christianity from this Medium,* [some believed it; *ergo,* it is true] *as by the Resurrection of* Christ: *Nor is every Woman or Mans Belief as good a Proof that the Gospel is true: I would not have Infidels taught to say,* If God damn me for not believing, it will be for not doing that which is as great a Mira-

cle as *Christ*'s Resurrection, and as great an Instance of Almighty Power, as the making of Sun and Moon, and of the World: *Overdoing is undoing.*

But if the men that I oppose, be religious, I cannot deny but it must be by Miracle or Madness: Consider and judge.

Is it any other to be for Religion, and to preach and labour, and suffer for it, if it have no Goodness in it, and will do no good, and must thus be believed? That is good that doth good. Dr. Crisp *is large and earnest in telling us, that nothing that we do, must be done to do us any good, or give us the least Gain or Advantage, nor must such a Thought come into our hearts, that we shall be ever the better for it; for* Christ *hath already done all that we need. And if it do us no good, it doth good to none. To God it can do none; if we be righteous, what do we give him. Our goodness extendeth not to him, by adding any thing to him.* Psal. 16. 1, 2. *And to men it can do no good, if it can do none to our selves; for either those men be elect, or not: If they be elect, all their good was perfected by* Christ, *as well as ours before they were born: And it will be as great an injury to* Christ, *to endeavour to do them any good, as our selves: And this either to their Souls or Bodies; for* Christ *hath purchased all good for both: Oh what an Antidote against Charity is here, and against doing good to all men, especially to them of the Household of Faith, and against feeding* Christ *in his Members!*

But if they are not elect, these men say that Christ *dyed not for them, to purchase them any good, and to do them good, is impossible; and what a Wrong would it be to* Christ, *for us to pretend to do men good without him, or his purchase?*

But

But they say, we must do it in Thankfulness, for being saved already: But what good is in that Thankfulness, when it doth no good to God or man, to our selves or others? Is not this to trust to works? All Acts with them are Works, *and Thankfulness is an Act or Habit.*

And if we are never the better for Love, Thanks, and Praises to God on earth, what the better shall we be for them in Heaven? What do these men preach for? What do they gather Churches for? And what do they exercise strictness for, by their self devised terms of their Church-Communion? What do they write for and wrangle for, while they profess that it is not to do any good, to God, to themselves, to the elect, or to the reprobate (which undenyably followeth)? I know you speak for Faith, Prayer, and Holiness, and I think you pray your selves: But to what end, Christ *saith,* ask and have, seek and find; *Dr.* Crispe *saith,* seek not to find: *O think not that you shall be ever the better for praying, or any thing else that you do in the greatest heigth of Piety. Is Prayer only a Thanksgiving? I knew an old Man (one* Dishforth, *by* Calverley *near* Bradford *in* Yorkshire) *who went among the Followers of* Hacket *and* Coppinger, *called,* Grundletonians (*from the Town where they lived*): *And going for Novelty among them, they breathed on him, and he came home so transported, that he left his former way of Praying in his Family, with Confession and Petition, and did all by Extasy, and Thanksgiving, and Praise, and so continued about a Fortnight, and then returned to Humility, and repented (himself and his Son were my Informers.)*

I wonder that it is not so with all that think praying, hearing, reading, meditating, and Sacraments do no good: And all from a Scottish Exposition of [Do this and live,] *as if it forbid doing any thing that*

we may live: And from an Unchristian Conceit that Christ *giveth us all that he decreeth or purchaseth, as soon as the Price is paid: And that because he freeth us from the Law of Works, and of Innocency, he maketh us lawless; or is a King that hath no Laws, or Laws that are neither the Measure of Duty or Judgment, the keeping of which is no subordinate Righteousness* in tantum; *because it is not as* Christ's, *a purchasing Price, and justifieth not primarily nor* in totum: *Or as if* Christ *commanded and gave a Righteousness which is no Righteousness; and that because all justifying is not* making Righteous, *therefore* making Righteous *is no* Justifying, *nor any part of it. It's a shame to stay to cite many Texts against these men, where the whole Bible, but especially all* Christ's *own Preaching, and Parables, are so expressly against them, that I admire with what face these men profess to believe the Scripture. And I wonder not that some of them say, that all the written Word is a Covenant of Works, and only the Spirits inward Work is the Covenant of Grace: And when they tell us (as* Crispe, p. 242. Vol. 1. Ed. 1.) That for any hurt that such sins can do us, it is not possible, for *Christ* hath made satisfaction. *I wonder why they preach against that which doth no hurt; and why they excommunicate men for sin; and why they scruple Perjury, Liturgies, Parish-Communion, or any Point of Conformity; yea, why some of them will suffer rather than conform, when it is impossible for any sin to hurt them: Why do your hearers pay you for Preaching against a harmless thing? Why make you so much Complaint against Unreformedness? Sin doth God no hurt; it doth not the Elect any hurt by your Doctrine; for* Christ *hath satisfied and born all: And the Reprobate are uncapable of good, for want of satisfaction for them. I pray you do not speak out this Doctrine to the World:*

If

If you do, I shall be glad that you are confined to your seduced ignorant Congregations. If you will tell the World, If you are elect, no sin can possibly hurt you; whatever Murders, Adulteries, Perjuries you commit it is none of your sin, but *Christs:* It cannot be his and yours too; and if not elect, you have no hope; and if you be elect, you will be never the better for praying, considering, charity, or any Act of Religion, or Justice, which you do, nor must once think to gain any thing by it: *How many Converts is this like to make? And what would such a Nation come to? I hope few of the publick Preachers that you call scandalous, preach so scandalously as this. I have one Request to you, that if you, or any other be questioned by the Judges for Murder, Adultery, False-witness, Perjury, or Robbery, you will not say as Dr.* Crispe *hath taught you* [*I am no Murderer, Adulterer, perjured Robber,* &c. *It is* Christ *that is such a one, and not I; it cannot be my sin, when he hath made it his*]; *for I doubt, neither the Judges or Jury well believe you: If you believe not me, ask the Judges, whether it be you or* Christ *that is the sinner? I doubt it is you that will be hang'd.*

If you say, [*for what may not ignorance say*] That it is not at the Bar of man, but of God only, that *Christ* is the sinner, and not we: *I Answer, Know you not that Judges and Princes are God's Officers, and that the Judgment is the Lords; and that what they do according to his Will, he doth by them: He doth not command Rulers to hang men for a sin that is none of theirs. All mens Judgments are Nullities, that are against the fore-known Judgment of God: It is the King that punisheth when the hangman executeth: God punisheth men by Rulers, and doth it righteously.*

I write all this, the rather because Mr. Cokain, *in his Preface, exhorteth Preachers to go on where the Dr. left: I humbly beseech them first to read and believe,* Mat. 5. & 6. *and* 7, 8. *and* 13. 18. 25. *and all the Sermons and Parables of* Christ; *and not downright to give him the Lie, and call it* exalting him: *And for them that report that there are no such Words in Dr.* Crispe, *as* I *report,* I *wonder not while they think that lying can do them no hurt, and is not their sin, but* Christs.

And they that believe they are under no Law, may believe that they have no Transgression, nor Christ *for them, when they had never any. And to them that talk of inherent Righteousness, as less necessary than God hath made it;* I *desire them but to mark what* Christ *saith of it, and to remember that sin is much of Hell, and holiness of Heaven: And that* Christ *came to save his People from their sins, as more righteous than the* Scribes *and* Pharisees *inherently, and to make them a peculiar People, zealous of good Works, and holy as God is holy; and to bethink them whether to disgrace the Building, be to honour the Architect; and whether the worth, or the worthlesness of the Work, more honour the Work-men; and whether the Cure of the Sick dishonour the Physitian: And whether to say, that my Clock or Watch will go by artificial means, or only no longer, than the Work mans Finger only moveth it, do more honour the Artist: And whether the Psalms would so much call us to glorifie God for his Works, if all that is ascribed to his Works, were taken from his Honour. The Lord teach us better to understand that Word, that maketh the simple wise, and not to set* Christ *against himself, and against his own Honours, Government and Laws,*

A

Defence of Christ,

AND

Free Grace, &c.

CHAP. I.

Prefatory.

Ortho. *SIR, Having my self, and the Congregation which I am Related to, been in danger of the Errours called* Antinomian; *I wrote to you, to intreat you, who have done so much heretofore, to Conquer and Extirpate those Errours, to get the* London *Ministers, to publish their Judgments against Dr.* Crispe's *Book, and such others, now Re-printed, and rising up with re-newed danger.*

Reconcil. You did so, and I answered you; 1. That I thought it not seasonable, till the acceptance and success of that Book and such others,

made our danger so notorious and great, as would clearly justify our Confutation: I have written on that Subject so much already, 1. In my *Confession of Faith.* 2. In my *Apologies* against Mr. *Crandon*, Mr. *Aaires*, and others. 3. In my *Disputations of Justification.* 4. In my *Life of Faith.* 5. In my *Justifying Righteousness*, and there against Dr. *Tully*; and my last *Animadversions* on Mr. *Cartwright.* 6. In my *Catholick Theology*, especially the five last Chapters. 7. And in my *Methodus Theologiæ.* All which, are unanswered to this day, that I know not why I should be forward to write much more: For they that will not read this that hath been so long written, are not like to read it if I yet write more.

And I am so fearful of stirring up the hidden spark of this mischief, that having written Fourteen Years ago a short Decision of a multitude of these Controversies, I suspended it, lest it should kindle New Oppositions.

2. And I told you, that we have now such publick and dangerous Controversies, about Royalty, Prelacy, Conformity, *&c.* that it is very unseasonable to make a noise of the Errours and Factions among the Tolerated, though they should somewhat increase by advantage of our silence, till we see what publick settlement there will be.

3. And I confess, I have an opinion that accidentally the Books which you fear, will so effectually confute themselves, that they will occasion more good among sober knowing Christians, than hurt to the ignorant professors, that will be tost up and down with every wind of Doctrine. For, 1. The whole tenour of the Bible is against them. And will not Christians read the Bible? 2. The Divine Nature on the Soul, and all Chri-

stian

ſtian Experience is againſt them. And will not Chriſtians know that Work and Doctrine of Gods Spirit in them?

For Inſtance, 1. Will they that are ſaved from Atheiſm ever believe that the moſt Holy God is the maker of ſins, yea, and made his own Son the greateſt ſinner in the World, when the Devil himſelf cannot make one man a ſinner, but only tempt him to be ſuch; yea, that God made himſelf (in the ſecond Perſon) a ſinner.

2. Will Chriſtians eaſily believe, that our Saviour came to deliver us from ſin, by making himſelf worſe than any of us, and becoming the greateſt hater of God and Godlineſs, the greateſt Infidel, Atheiſt, Blaſphemer, Murderer, Adulterer, Lyar, Thief, *&c.* in all the World, and conſequently like the Devil, hated of God, and having a Hell in himſelf? All Chriſtians believe that our ſins were laid upon Chriſt as to their penalty, that he was *Vicarius pœnæ*, that he ſuffered for us, the juſt for the unjuſt, to reconcile us to God, and that he was made for us, a Sacrifice for ſin, that we might be healed by his ſtripes, and waſhed in his Blood.

But what Chriſtian can believe Dr. *Criſpe* and his Sectaries, that Chriſt took not only the puniſhment and guilt (*reatum pœnæ*) but all the very ſins themſelves of all the Elect, habitual and actual, privative and poſitive, of omiſſion and commiſſion, and ſo really became the moſt wicked man in all the World; and that he ſaveth us from ſin, by becoming a thouſand times worſe himſelf, than any of us; when it cannot be proved that any one Devil had ſo great a hand in mans ſin, as to make all our ſins his own? And Dr. *Criſpe* well vindicateth God from falſe Imputation of that ſin

to

to Christ, which was not his: But it is by Blasphemy, making that his, which was never his, even the very sins of all the Elect. 3. And do you think any Soul that hath the Spirit of God, and readeth and believeth the Scriptures can believe this Dr. *that no sin can possibly hurt the Elect*, because they are fully saved already by Christ? And that it is against Christ and his Grace, to intend our Salvation, or any good to our selves by any Duty we do, or to look to be ever the better for praying, obeying, believing, but must do all only in thankfulness, and for the good of others.

4. Do you think that a man (not to say a Christian) can believe that the torments of the *Stone*, *Gout*, *Collick*, *Convulsion*, *&c.* are no hurt, or no castigatory Penalty? And that it is no hurt or punishment for an Elect Person to be under decays of Holiness, increase of Sin, prevalency of Temptations, the terrours of God, and loss of his Consolations, and fears of Death: He that can believe all this, may believe *Transubstantiation* against all the senses of mankind. A Hundred of such Instances may be named, which have so ugly a countenance, that men that love their Souls, will be affrighted from *Antinomianism*, by the reading of them. And I further tell you, that too sudden and eager disputing against Heresy, doth but engage men to stretch their wits to find out what to say to defend it, and to take those for Enemys to God and them, who shame their folly.

And I must confess, that tho' I am much for Ministers associations and consultations in order to Concord and mutual Edification; I am not much for the way of deciding doctrinal Controversies

verſies by majority of Votes, remembring what Councils have done that way theſe 1300 Years, and how often either errour or unskilful deciſſions have the greater number; ſo that tho' now with us, they will conſent againſt errours; it may be taken for a precedent for erroneous pluralities, to Tyrannize or tread down truth hereafter.

Ortho. *But ſhall we therefore let Hereſy ſpread unreſiſted.*

Reconcil. No, But you will let it paſs uncured, whether you will or not: You let not ignorance, and pride, go unreſiſted: But if it were not uncured, there would be no ſuch Hereſies. If all the Miniſters in *England* ſubſcribe a deteſtation of groſs ignorance and pride, do you think it would cure them? Doth it cure Atheiſm, Infidelity, Drunkenneſs, Luſt, though all Preachers condemn them?

If you can prevail with theſe men, to read and conſider but one half of that which I have written on theſe Subjects, inſtead of reviling that which they never read or tryed, you will not need to call for more Confutations of them.

Ortho. *But a Confutation ſhort and newly publiſhed, will be read by thoſe that will not read Books old and large.*

Reconcil. I have ſtaid ſince your firſt motion, to ſee whether there be like to be any apparent neceſſity of any renewed oppoſition to this infection; and I acknowledge, that now ſome neceſſity appeareth to me, in the new and zealous attempts of the erroneous: But God in great mercy, hath raiſed up many that are fitter to oppoſe them, than I that in pain and languiſhing weakneſs, have time little enough to meditate on my approaching change. But becauſe the erroneous have learn'd of the transformed Angel of Light, and

his

his pretended Miniſters of Righteouſneſs, to call their Errours, *the Preaching of Chriſt, and Free Grace*, and to ſay, that all they Preach not *Chriſt*, but the *Righteouſneſs of man*, that wrong not Chriſt as much as they; I ſhall by God's help attempt briefly to try, whether indeed they *Preach Chriſt*, or *Preach againſt him*; and whether they *Exalt him*, or *Deny him*; and whether they Preach up *Free Grace*, or as *Enemies Reproach* it. And I ſhall publiſh a brief Deciſion of the many Controverſies of Juſtification, which I caſt by theſe Fourteen Years, leſt I ſhould provoke any to revive the allay'd quarrels: But their new and earneſt Attempts, do now call it out, by telling us, that this evil Spirit is again at work, and calleth us to a renewed Defence of Truth.

CHAP. II.

An Enumeration of the Errours which have corrupted Chriſtianity, *and ſubverted the* Goſpel.

Reconcil. BEfore I give you a Confutation of the Errours of the *Anti-Goſpellers*, I will promiſe theſe two things:

1. I will here give you a Catalogue of their Errours which I am to Confute. 2. I think it needful to caution you, what to think of the Perſons, that you Cenſure them not too hardly, tho' the Errours as worded, be very great.

I. And 1. As the general Fault of their Errours, is the confounding of things which greatly differ; ſo by this, they corrupt the Doctrine of *Adams* Communication of ſin and guilt to his poſterity, and thereby raiſe more dangerous Errours. They

They feign, that God made a Covenant with *Adam*, (and all his Posterity say some, as in him) that if he stood, God would continue him and his Posterity; and if he fell, God would take it as if all his Posterity then personally, sinned in him; and so, that either we were all then personally in him, or God by Imputation would take us to have so been: And so that God's Covenant and Imputation, made *Adams* sin, ours, further than it is by natural propagation; not truly distinguishing between our being *Personally* in him, and being but *Virtually*, and *Seminally* in him: And feigning God to make *Adam* not only the Natural Father and Root of Mankind, but also Arbitrarily, a Constituted Representer of all the Persons that should spring from him; and so that God made them sinners, that were none, and that, before he made them men.

II. Whence they infer, that Christ was by Gods imposition and his own sponsion, made the Legal Representative Person of every one of the Elect taken singularly; so that what he did for them, God reputeth them to have done by him.

III. Hereby they falsly make the Person of the Mediator, to be the legal Person of the sinner, and deny the true Mediatorship.

IV. But they cannot agree, when this Personating of the Elect began: Some say, It had no beginning, but was from Eternity; because Election was from Eternity, and we were Elected in Christ; and so were Persons from Eternity in him.

V. Others say, That it began at the making of the World, Christ being then the first of Gods Works in a Super-angelical Nature, emaning from the Divine, which contained all our Persons in it; as the Beams are of, or in the Sun.

VI. Others

VI. Others say, that this Personation began at the giving to *Adam* the first Law or Covenant of *Innocency*, and that Christ was a person in the Bond or Covenant: And that the meaning of it was, *Thou or Christ personating thee, shall perfectly Obey; or Thou or He shall Die the threatned death for Sin.*

VII. Others say, that this Personation began at the making of the Promise, *Gen.* 3. of the *Seed of the Woman*, &c. And so, that Christ personated none under the first Covenant.

VIII. Others say, that it began at Christs *Incarnation*, when he took the Nature of Man, and therewith all our Persons.

IX. Others say, that it began on his Cross, or at least, at his Humiliation, and that he only suffered in our persons.

X. Others say, that it begins at our Believing and our Union with Christ by Faith; and then he by Union personateth us.

XI. They deny Gods Covenant or Law of *Innocency*, that required our Personal Obedience, as the condition of Life.

XII. They forge a Law that God never made, that saith, *Thou, or thy Surety, shall Obey Perfectly, or Dye.*

XIII. They falsly say, that God justifyeth none that are not really or imputatively perfectly *Innocent*, *Obedient*, and such as never *Sinned*, but kept all that Law.

XIV. They confound Gods Covenant with Christ as Mediator, imposing on him his Mediatorial part, and the Covenant of the Father and Son, with faln Man, imposing on them the terms of Recovery and Life.

XV. They hold that the first Law (and some of them also *Moses's* Law) is done away as to all

all the Elect, but is still in force to all the Reprobates, and was in force to Christ: But whether it bound him to Obedience as our Representative antecedently to mans fall, or only consequently, they are in their confusion at a loss. And they hold that its curse and penalty sentenced after the fall by God, fell on all the Reprobate and on Christ, but none of it on any of the Elect, as having been suffered by Christ fully for them.

As I have said, The promissary part of that Law ceased, and so did the condition of the promise, by mans sin making it impossible; but the threat did *transire in sententiam:* And if Christ was antecedently in the bond of Obedience for us, he was bound not to Eat of the forbidden Tree, and bound to dress the Garden, and bound to take *Eve* for his Wife, *&c.* which are all false.

If he were bound by it as our representative after the fall, it bound him when it ceased, and bound not us, which is false: And therefore it was only the Law of perfect Innocency anew imposed on himself, by the Mediatorial Covenant that bound him.

And if the Penal Sentence and Curse, be Executed on all the Reprobate, then it is not ceased: And then it must be a Penalty, and that Curse, even on the Elect before they believe, because till then, they have no part in Christ. And after they believe, they must bear part of that Penalty, called a Curse, which was fixed, and not reversed and pardoned; that is, The privation of those degrees of Grace, Peace, and Joy, which they should have had if there had been no sin: The Curse on the Earth, Sorrow in Child-bearing, and Death: These cease not now to be Penals, but are Sanctified Penalties. A Curse turned to a Blessing; an Evil made a Medicine

Medicine to our good; Correction is truly Penal, tho' profitable; Christ suffered to attain his own Ends, and not to cross them; His Ends was not to free the Elect from his own Government, or Correcting Justice.

XVI. They affirm, that the Covenant is made only with Christ, for us, but not with us: As if God made none with man, and Baptizing and Christianity were not Covenanting.

XVII. They feign God to have made an eternal Covenant with his Son; that is, God imposing on God, the Law of Mediation.

XVIII. They most dangerously affirm, that Christ took not only the punishment of our sin, and that guilt, or *Reatum pœnæ*, which is an assumed obligation to suffer the punishment deserved by us, (to be *Vicarius pœnæ*) but *all our very Sins themselves:* the very *Essence* of the *Sin of all the Elect*; the *Reatum Culpæ:* So that, tho' he never did sin himself, yet all our sins, habitual and actual, positive and privative, of commission and omission, became truly and properly Christs own sins: And so, that he was truly judged a hater and blasphemer of God and Holiness, and the greatest murderer, adulterer, thief, lyar, perjured Traytor in all the World, the sins of all the Elect being truly His sins. Of which Dr. *Crisp* is positive and large.

XVIIII. They say, that God laid these sins of ours on him, and made him properly sin for us, and not only a Sacrifice for sin: And so, that God is the Maker of the greatest Sin.

XIX. They say, that Gods Imputation being truly but the accounting one to be what he is; had not God made him a Sinner, his imputing or reckoning him such, had been a Lye; which is true, tho' they infer Falshood from it, taking Imputation of Sin, strictly for a true Estimation. XX. They

XX. They that make this Imputation to be before the Incarnation, make God to make himself this great Sinner; that is, Christ while he was meer God: And so make us a wicked God. When Satan can but Tempt us to sin, and its not proved that any one Devil is guilty of all mens sins, they make God guilty of all; yea, they that lay it on Christ only after his Incarnation, lay it on him that is God.

XXI. They that feign Christ to have personated us in his first Covenant of Redemption, make us by him, to have Covenanted to Redeem our selves, and to do the Mediator-work.

XXII. They feign Christ to have made such an Exchange with the Elect, as that having taken all their Sins, he hath given them all his Righteousness; not only the *Fruit of it*, but the *Thing in it self*: So that they are as perfectly Righteous as Christ himself, and so esteemed of God.

But here they differ; 1. Some say we have only all his *Passive Righteousness*: Some say also all his *Active*: 3. Others also all his *Habitual*: 4. Others, all his *Essential Divine Righteousness*; and so are Goded.

XXIII. This perfect Righteousness, they say we have at least from the time of Christ's death, before we were born, or had any personal Beeing.

XXIV. Hereby they must needs feign Christ, and us to be one and the same Subject; or else the same Accidents, Habits, Acts and Relations to be in divers Subjects, still the same, which is a contradiction.

XXV. Hence they say, that the elect have no sin, because it is all Christ's, and cannot be his and theirs also.

XXVI. They say that Christ having perfectly

done the Work of a Saviour, we are perfectly saved, and want nothing necessary to Salvation.

XXVII. They say all sin past, present, and to come, are pardoned, even that not committed (that is no sin.)

XXVIII. They say, that it is not possible that sin can do an elect Person any hurt, Christ having been a perfect Saviour from it all; so Dr. *Crispe*.

XXIX. They say, that no Prayer, or Duty, or Act of Man, can do us any good, or further our Salvation, Christ only having done it already for us: so *Crispe*.

XXX. They add, that to pray, hear, read, obey, or do any Duty, *as a means to our own Good, or Salvation*, is to sin against the *Free Grace* of Christ: But that we must do it, 1. In thankfulness to Christ, that hath saved us. 2. And for the good of others.

As if it were not as injurious to *Free Grace*, to seek other mens Salvation as our own; or we might not do good in love to our selves, as well as to our Neighbours: Or, as if we ought not to plow, sow, labour, eat, drink, build, *&c.* for our good; because Christ is all: By this it seemeth, that Dr. *Crispe* did not *preach or write his Books to do any good*; because he took that to be a denyal of Christs Grace.

XXXI. They say, that under *Moses* Law, *David* and the Elect, were not pardoned, till they had sacrificed: But under the Gospel, all the elect are absolutely pardoned, without any delay, or condition, or means on their part; as if there had been so vast a difference between the Fruits of Christ, and the way of his Justification, then and now.

XXXII. They say, that Pardon and Justification are absolutely perfect at the first, and so no more sin to be after forgiven, nor any punishment to be remitted or removed.

XXXIII.

XXXIII. They say, that no elect person suffereth any the least punishment; because all is forgiven, and Christ suffered all; and that no Pain or Correction is now penal, or for sin.

XXXIV. They talk of our being freed from the Law, in so undistinguishing universal Words, as if they knew no Law, but that of Innocency to *Adam*, and that of *Moses* to the *Jews*, and thought it were a priviledge to be lawless, or that Christ had no Law; and so there were no Transgression.

XXXV. They hold, that Christ was no Law-Maker, and so must infer, that he was no King, and had no Laws of his own, to Govern or Judge by; and so deny a chief Part of his Office, and his Kingdom, and Government, who is King of Kings.

XXXVI. They say, If God should punish any sin of the elect, it would be injustice; because it is all punished already on Christ, and the Debt is fully paid by him.

XXXVII. They take God's Covenants and Laws to be things so different, as that a Law is not his Covenant, nor his Covenant a Law: Whereas, διαθηκη signifieth both; that is, God's Statute-Law, containing the determinate Terms of Duty, Reward and Punishment, Life and Death; and both have the same parts, his Law having Precepts, Prohibitions, Promises, and Threatnings; and his Covenant, as his hath the same: And when it its συνθηκη, it becometh a mutual Covenant by mans Consent; and the Law bindeth Subjects to that Consent.

XXXVIII. They are so much for a Christ without us, that they write as if the Work of Christ within us, and by us, were a Dishonour to Christ, that causeth it, if we praise it: As if the Praise

of the Structure were a dishonour to the Builder; or the Cure were a dishonour to the Physitian, or the Glory of the World, if praised, were a dishonouring of God. God praiseth his Servants, and their Grace and Works; but if we praise them, they say, we rob Christ of his honour.

XXXIX. They seem to hold, that Christ doth all the Work of our Salvation, immediately, without Instruments, or Means: And all that is ascribed to subordinate Causes, were derogate from him: And so Apostles, Miracles, Scripture, Writings, Preaching, were no Means of Good, or injured Christ; as if Sun and Moon, Angels and Men, dishonoured God.

XL. While they say, that no Duty must be done, for our own good, or salvation, they destroy natural necessary self love, and directly would drive out all true Religion from the World, and harden all the wicked in ungodliness, by taking away those Motives, without which, no men are converted, or saved, and kept from sin.

XLI. They hold, that whatever Law or Promise in Scripture, hath any condition, is part of the Law of Works? And that the Law or Covenant of Grace, is only of what God will actually and absolutely himself effect, or that Efficience it self; as if the Gospel were a Law of Works.

XLII. Accordingly, they hold, that God doth not make any conditional Promise, or threatning a means of his Spirit, or Christs communicating of Free Grace: And so that the Gospel hath no conditional Promises, tho' there be conditional Words; not understanding that God, who is Life, Light, and Love; Power, Wisdom and Goodness, worketh by all three, and printeth the Image of all on his Elect, working by efficient Motion,

tion, sapiental Order, and amorous attractive communication.

XLIII. They hold, that no mens sins were the cause of *Christ*'s Sufferings, but the Elects: And that the rest are damned for want of a sufficient Sacrifice offered for them.

XLIV. They hold, that all the Mercies that the Non elect have in all the world, are given them without the Purchase of *Christ*.

XLV. Yea, many hold, that none but the Elect have any Grace, or any Mercy: because it will end in their Damnation: And so Conscience hath no just Accusation, in Hell, or here, as for any sinning against Mercy; nor do they owe God thanks for any.

XLVI. Whereas God hath made, through *Christ*, a general Act of Grace, or Gift of *Christ*, Pardon, and Life eternal, to all the World, on condition of fiducial Acceptance of it as a Free Gift, and commanded the Offer of it to all; and will doubly condemn the final Refuser; and by this Gospel-gift, as his Instrument, pardoneth, and justifieth the believing accepters. These men deny the very being of this Gospel-Act: They deny it to be either *Christ*'s Law, or Covenant, or Grant.

XLVII. They hold, that *Christ*, in our stead, did all that the Law bound us to do; as if he had been a Husband, a Father, a Souldier. *&c.*

XLVIII. They say, That Christs satisfaction by Sacrifice, was the the *solutio ejusdem*, the payment of the same debts of suffering that was due to us; and not properly satisfaction, which is, *Redditio æquivalentis*, or *tantidem alias in debiti*: as if he had suffered death Spiritual by loss of Holiness, and the torments of Hell by an accu-

sing Conscience, and the hatred of God.

XLIX. They say, That by the Imputation of his Righteousness, habitual and actual, we are judged perfectly Just; that is, such as have no sin, yet he suffered in our Person for our sins; which we are reputed never to have.

L. They say, That the Inherent and Active Righteousness which consisteth in our Faith, Repentance, Love, and sincere Obedience, wrought by Christ in us, doth not Constitute us Righteous in Subordination to Christs meritorious Righteousness, in any part or degree; that is, that it is Righteousness, that *in tantum*, maketh no man ever the more Righteous, than if he had it not; *q. d. Albedo quæ non facit album*, or *Paternitas quæ non constituit Patrem*; not distinguishng *universal* and *particular* Righteousness.

LI. They talk of Justification, in meer ignorant confusion; not knowing the various senses of the Word, or the divers parts of the Work: They deride, that distinctions which no reason can deny; they confound *Justifying Efficiently*, *Justifying Constitutively*, *Justifying Virtually*, by the *Gospel-Gift*, or *Law* of *Grace*; *Justifying by Evidence*, *Justifying by Witness*, *Justifying by Plea* and *Advocate*, *Justifying by Judicial Sentence*, and by *Execution*. They set the Causes against each others, as if it were a thing that had but *one Cause*; when they meet with the word used for *Sentential Justification* by decisive Judgment; they Exclude all the included and supposed Acts, that is, *making Men just Efficiently*, *constitutive Matter and Form*, or *Subject* and *Relation*; the *Gospel Donation* and *Condonation*, and all such previous Acts: And when they have done, not knowing what they affirm or deny; they only cry up, the name of *Christs Righteousness Imputed*,

puted, not knowing what *Imputation* is, nor what sort of Cause *Christs Righteousness* is, whether *Efficient*, or *Material*, or *Formal* by *Constitution*, and and think its *true Meritorious Causality* is too little. And in their description, exclude *sentential decisive Justification*, which they had denominated it to be, making it to be only the *Donation* of *Christs perfect Righteousness* as in *its Essence*, to be *ours*; and so joyning the efficient and constitutive Causes, yet leaving out the *Instrumental Efficient*, which is the *Gospel Donation*, or *Covenant-Gift*, and calling *Faith* the *instrumental Cause*, which is no *Efficient Cause*, but a *Moral Reception of the Free-Gift*, and a *Moral Qualification* as a *Receptive Condition*, for our Title to the possession: And whereas God never *Judged a man Righteous*, till he had *made him Righteous*; they say, That to Justify, is not to *make Righteous*, but to *judge Righteous*, and yet describe *judging* by *making*: Yea, and exclude the sentential Justification at the day of Judgment, thinking that it is all perfectly at our first Justification Sentenced. As if God the Father, Christ as King, or Prophet, the Holy Ghost, the Covenant of Grace, Faith, had no hand in our Justification, but Christs Righteousness imputed only.

LII. They talk much against being Justified by the *To Credere*, the Act of Faith; and when they have done, ignorantly, are the maintainers of it against those that deny it. For when we say that *Faith doth not Justify us*, as that Phrase signifieth Efficiency, but that we are only said to be *Justified by it*, as signifying a Receptive Condition, or Qualification; they say, that it Justifieth us as an Instrument which is an Efficient Cause: And it is the very Act or *To Credere* (or nothing) which they call that Instrument: And thus they

make a War againſt themſelves, while they ignorantly accuſe they know not what.

LIII. They blindly take *Paul* by *Works* to mean all *humane Acts*; when as, 1. The whole ſcope of his diſputing, is, againſt *Juſtification by the Works which are ſet in oppoſition*, or *competition with Juſtification by Chriſt*, and by *Free Grace*, ſuch as the *Jews* thought the keeping of *Moſes*'s Law was; which is the Law that he doth all along ſpeak of. 2. And he expreſly deſcribeth the *Works* that he excludeth, to be *thoſe* that are ſuppoſed to *make the Reward to be of Debt* (for the value of the Work) and *not of Grace*: And do they know any *Proteſtant* that is either for Juſtification, or Salvation by any ſuch Works, or for the being of any ſuch? 3. And is not Faith a *humane Act*? And doth not *Paul* moſt plainly and frequently ſay, we are *Juſtified* by it? And did he call *Faith, Works*?

LIV. But to anſwer this, they erre as groſly, ſaying, that [*by Faith imputed for Righteouſneſs*] and *our being Juſtified by Faith*] is not meant the the *Act* or *Habit* of *Faith*, but the *Object*, *Chriſt*'s *Righteouſneſs*; not ſticking hereby to turn all ſuch Texts into worſe than *Nonſence*; Put *Chriſt*'s *Righteouſneſs* inſtead of the Word [*Faith*] in all thoſe Texts, and try how it will run? And why is *Faith* named if it have no part in the Senſe? They ſay, That it Juſtifieth not as a *Work*: I ſay, it Juſtifieth not efficiently at all; much leſs as a *Work* in *Paul*'s ſenſe, that maketh the Reward to be not of Grace, but of Debt. Nor doth it Juſtify as an *Act* in *genere*; for then, a *quaternus ad omne*, every *Act* would Juſtify; nor yet as a meer *good Act* or *Work*: For then, every good *Act* would Juſtify as it doth. But we are Juſtified by, 1. This *Faith* in *ſpecie*, which is our *Fiducial*

ducial Reception of Christ. 2. And that as it is formally made by God, the condition of our participiation of the Gift, which is Christ and his Justifying Meritorious Righteousness. Christ is not instead of *Faith*, and *Faith* is not instead of *Christ:* It is Christ believed in, and received; and not Christ without *belief* and *reception.*

And when they say, That it is the *Object* and not the *Act*; they multiply the Proclamations of their undistinguishing ignorance, unskilfully pretending to distinguish: For the *Object Christ*, is considerable; 1. In *esse reali*, in himself. 2. Or in *esse objectivo*, which is, but in *esse cognito*, in Idea or Notion: Christ in *esse reali*, indeed, Justifieth us, by Dying for us, and Meriting for us, and doing that which Faith never did: But Christ in *esse objectivo*, or *cognito*, and in our minds, is the *form* of this Faith in *specie* it self, and not to be Justified by the *Act* of Faith in Christ, is not to be Justified by the Object as such; for the Object essentially specifieth the *Act*; thus illogycal heads confound Holy things.

LV. But these that must have the *Object* of this Faith only to Justify, exclude most essential parts of the Object it self. The Baptismal Faith, is not their Justifying Faith: Belief in God the Father, and in the Holy Ghost, is none of it, and so God the Father, and the Holy Ghost, are none of the Justifying Object; when as it is essential to Christ, as the Object to be one with the Father, and sent by Him, and to be his express Image, and the way to Him, *&c.* And to be Conceived by the Holy Ghost, and to be attested and to operate by him.

LVI. Yea,

LVI. Yea, these undistinguishers are such dividers, that they exclude most that is essential to Christ himself, as Mediator, from being the Object of their Justifying Faith: It is not his Prophetical Office, nor his Holy Example or Doctrine; nor his Kingly Office, either in Legislation or Judgment; tho' it be as King, that he Justifieth by Sentence and Execution: It is not any part of his Priestly Office, but his Righteousness, habitual, instead of habitual and original Righteousness; active, instead of our active Righteousness; and passive instead of our punishment: It is not his Priestly Intercession in Heaven, nor his giving the Holy Ghost, nor his Raising, Judging, or Glorifying us, that are the Objects of this Faith.

LVII. But yet they will fallaciously seem subtile by distinguishing, and say, that tho' none of these are the Objects of *Fides qua Justificat*, Faith as *Justifying*, yet they are the Objects of *Fides quæ Justificat*, of that Faith which Justifieth by another *Act*, meer fallacy. 1. Here they must take *Faith* for the *Habit*; for if it were for the *Act*, two divers *Acts* are not the same. 2. How is that *Habit quæ Justificat*, when they say only Reception by its Instrumentality Justifieth; and that's only the *Act*? 3. But *qua Justificat* fallaciously implyeth that *Faith Efficiently Justifieth*, whereas it is only a *Dispositio Moralis Receptiva* as a *Condition* (and they deny its constitutive Causality) and that (*Fides qua Fides, Justifieth at all*) and as a dispositive Condition, it is a belief in much more than Christs Imputed Righteousness.

LVIII. And these ill dividing men, pretending to subtilty, telling us, that it is but one Act of Faith by which it justifieth, are so far from being able to tell what that one Act is, That, it is enough

to

to cast all their Disciples into despair, if, till they know it, they must not know that they are justified.

LIX. For they feign it to be one only Physical Act, whereas, in Moral Subjects, an Act containeth many Physical Acts: Faith in Christ is a Covenanting Act, like a contract of Marriage, or between Prince and Subjects, or Captain and Soldiers, which is many Physical Acts.

LX. Hereupon they are at a loss in what faculty it is, whether the Intellects Assent, or the Wills Consent, or Affiance or Practical Obedience; and whether it be one Act only *numero*, or only *specie*, and what individuates an Act?

LXI. And they unavoidably cast men upon their supposed *Justification by works*, while they feign all Acts, save that one (they know not what) to be Works: Yea, many take every Act to be *Works*, as is aforesaid.

As when they say, that it is *only resting on Christs Righteousness, as made ours in it self by imputation*; they hereby make the Belief of the Godhead, and of the truth of the Gospel, and of the Life to come, and Repentance, and Confessions, and Love to God and to Christ, and Thankfulness, and Prayer, and Self-denial, to be all works of the Law, which Free Grace in this excludeth.

If *Assent* be that one Justifying Act, then he that thinketh it is Consent, or Hope, or Trust; or that denying his own Righteousness is any part of it, is fallen from Grace, by looking for Justification by Works.

LXII. They do not only say, that Grace is not free, if it have any positive Condition, but also if it have any negative Condition; that is, that if a pardon be offered a Traytor, on Condition that he

he will not refuse it, cast it in the fire, and spit in the Face of him that offereth it, or will not seek his Death: this is no free pardon, unless he may have leave to hate and stab the Prince that pardoneth him.

And here you see what these take for *Works*; even such things as are neither Works nor Acts at all, but meer nothings. Not to resist, oppose, refuse, dispise Grace: not to believe the Devil and his agents, that call Christ a deceiver, and that deny God and the life to come: I do not say, that such meer negatives are all the condition of pardon and justification; but these are included in the positive condition; and yet to take any of these for any part of the condition, is supposed to be, to look for Justification by *Works*, because all such conditions are taken for *Works*, save one simple Act of Faith.

LXIII. This is because they know not what a meer Condition is, when they have laid Salvation on the denial of it; when as it is no cause at all (as such) of the effects, but as imposed, it is a bar put to the effect till the Condition be performed; as the Lawyers say, *Lex addita negotio quæ donec præstetur eventum suspendat*; and as *performed*, it is the *removing* of that *impediment*. Opening the Windows, or not shutting them is no *cause* of the Light; nor opening our Eye-lids any cause of our seeing; but a removing of that which hindereth the light: It is a necessary disposition of the Receiver, but no efficient cause of the effect; and so is Faith to our Justification or Pardon.

And therefore note, That whereas many Reforming Protestants write for the instrumentall Interest of Faith in our Justification, I number not them with the forementioned subverters of the Gospel; for by

by *Instrumentality* they mean no *Efficiency*, but *Receptivity*; unhappily using the name of an Instrument improperly and without due explication; and as Dr. *Twise* tollerably calleth it, *Causam dispositivam subjecti recipientis*; so Dr. *Kendal* likeneth it to boys playing at ball or cat, that make their hats the instruments to catch the ball or cat in: This giveth them no efficiency, so that they only miscarry by choosing an equivocal Name, and placeing too much of the Controversie on that Name, when there be proper words enough at hand; and also in that they distinguish not duly between *Physical* and *Moral Reception*, when they should tell us that *Faith* is not the *Physical*, but the *Moral Reception* of *Christ*, to *Receive in sensu Physico*, is nothing else but to be the *Passive terminus*, of an Agents efficiency, and is signified by Passive Verbs. To receive *Justification*, *Sanctification*, *Adoption* Physically, is nothing but *Justificari*, *Sanctificari*, &c. to be Justified, Sanctified, Adopted: But to receive Morally, is *Accipere*, to accept the gift by consent, and exercise that consent by contract, and containeth (as is aforesaid) many Physical Acts; as to receive a Tutor, a Master, a Physitian, a King, a Husband, &c. And such is Faith, a receiving (not of righteousness only) but of Christ with all his offered benefits.

And when they say, that other Acts or Graces may be *Conditions*, but none but Faith is the *Instrument*; 1. Certainly that called by them Instrumentality, is but the τὸ *credere*; the Act it self *in specie*, and the *Conditionality* is the nearest reason of its Interest in our Justification. 2. And there is nothing more in the Nature of *Assent*, *Trust*, or any Act of Faith, besides meer *Acceptance* or *Consent*, why they should be called *Receiving*, than in *Love*, *Desire*,

Desire, *Gladness*, *Hope*, or *Seeking*. 3. And *Accepting* Christ as our Teacher, King, and Intercessor in Heaven, is as much conditional and necessary to our Justification and Salvation, as accepting his Justification and Deliverance from Punishment. That which men are most averse to (Love, Holiness, and Obedience) is made the Condition of that which men more easily accept.

And indeed those that (*in sensu Physico*) they call *Other* Conditional Acts, are but modifications, or parts of the same *Moral* Act which is the Condition. The Faith by which we are justified, is that true *Christianity* which includeth our believeing consent to God the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost; our belief of Christ, and our thankful acceptance of him to be our Teacher, Intercessor or Priest, and King, with his offered Grace; and that this acceptance is with *Desire*, *Love*, and *Hope*, expresst in a holy Contract or Covenant. This is the Souls Marriage with Christ, and Allegiance to him, and it includeth the renouncing our trust in all Creatures, or in any Righteousness of our own, so far as they would usurp the least part of Christ's Office, Work, or Honour.

None of all this is Justification by Works.

LXIV. They erroneously tell us, That nothing is properly a *Condition*, which is it self a *Free Gift*. As if God could not *Command* and *Give* the same thing, and make his Command a congruous means of Giving.

LXV. They erroneously hold, that nothing can be called a Condition of one Gift of the Covenant, which is not a Condition of all: Whereas God hath many Anticedent Gifts before any Condition be so much as imposed: Without any Condition, he gave us our Being, and gave us a Saviour,

viour, and the Gospel, and the conditional *Covenant*, and offers of Grace: And why may not the reception and use (or not rejecting) of a former Gift of Grace, be made a condition of the giving of more? *To him that hath, shall be given*: may not Faith be the gift of God, and yet be the condition of Justification and Salvation?

LXVI. They erroneously hold, that when a man is once justified, the continuance of his justification is Absolute, and hath no imposed conditions: contrary to Christs own words, *Joh.* 15. and many plain texts of Scripture.

LXVII. They erroneously put *Free Grace* and *Free Will* in such opposition, as if nothing could be an act of Free Grace, which imposeth any condition on Free Will: which is true, if by *Free Will* they mean *Freedom* of Natural sufficiency, as Free without Grace from vitious habits and inclinations; for we have no such Free Will: But these men know not what *Free Will* is, nor distinguish Freedom from Prohibitions, and from Constraint, and necessitating predeterminating efficient Premotion, from Moral Freedom.

LXVIII. In some points forementioned about *Faith* and Justification, the unapt Words and Methods of some Reformers give them advantage; But Dr. *Crispe* and the gross *Antinomians*, take *Faith* to be neither Cause nor Condition of Justification, but meerly the receptive belief, that we are Justified already (before we were born); so that Faith justifieth only in our consciences, which is but to be conscious that we are Justified.

LXIX. Accordingly Dr. *Crispe* maintaineth, that Election and Justification are known only by two means, The Spirit within revealing it, and Faith receiving it; that is, The Spirit inwardly saying,

ing, *Thou art Elect and Justified, and Faith believing this*; so that neither of these Justifie us, but only make us know it.

LXX. They mistake the meaning of the *Witness of the Spirit*; As if it were but an inward Inspiration and Impulse equal to a voice, saying, *Thou art Elect and Justified*; Whereas it is an Inherent Impress, and so an objective Evidencing witness, even the Divine Nature, and Image of God, and the habit of Divine filial Love, by which Gods Spirit marketh us out as adopted: As likeness of the child to the Father, and love, are an evidencing witness of true Son-ship: And as Reason is a witness that we are Men, And as Learning is a witness that we are Learned: So Sanctity is an evidencing witness that we are the children of God; *Holiness to the Lord*, is his Mark: And he that nameth the name of *Christ*, departing from iniquity, hath Gods Impress: Yet there are other subsequent parts of the Spirits witness; that is, 1. Causing us to exercise; 2. And to know the Grace that he hath given us; 3. And exciting in us a joyful perception of it.

LXXI. Hereby they destroy the assurance and comfort of most (if not almost all) true Christians in the world; because they have not that inspiration or certain inward word of assurance, that they are Elect and Justified. I have known very few that said they had it: And of those few, some fell to Debauchery, and some to doubting. And though Prophetical Inspiration prove it self to them that have it, its not possible for others to know, but that a counterfeit Fanatick conceit may be it.

LXXII. Hereby the Ungodly are dangerously tempted to damning presumption, and security: while,

while, if they do but confidently believe that they are Elect and Justified, they are quieted in sin.

LXXIV. Dr. *Crispe* copiously maintaineth, that a Man cannot be sure that he is Justified either by *Sincerity*, or *Universal* Obedience, or love to the Godly, or any such Grace; To the dishonour of Holiness, the contradiction of Scripture, and the overthrow of the comfort of Believers.

LXXV. They tell us, that we must not fix set-times for Prayer, or other Worship, but stay till Gods Spirit move us, or tell us when to Pray. As if God were not the God of Order, but of Confusion; and did not move us as reasonable creatures, by a rational guidance of us: They would be loth to follow their crooked Rule in common things, and to keep no set-times for their Trading, Labours, Dyet and Rest; and not to work or eat, or sleep, till the Spirit moveth them. And God maketh use of Reason and Order, in things Spiritual as well as in things Natural? And the Spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets.

LXXVI. They reprove us for perswading Unconverted Men to Pray, because the Prayer of the Wicked is abominable; and they should stay till they have the Spirit of Prayer: And is a Tavern or a Whore-house, a fitter place to get that Spirit, than on their knees by Prayer? when God himself saith; *To thee shall all flesh come: seek the Lord while he may be found; call upon him while he is near: Let the Wicked forsake his way*, &c. wicked Prayers of wicked men, that are but to quiet them in sin, are abominable; and no prayer of an Impenitent unbeliever hath any promise of certain success. But *Ahab*, and *Nineve*, and millions of Sinners have found, that there are some

prayers of the unregenerate, that are better than none. And do they think, when we perſwade them to Pray, that we perſwade them to continue Impenitent? No, it is but perſwading them to Turn and Live: For praying is a returning motion, and we ſay but as *Peter*, *Repent and Pray, if perhaps the thoughts of thy heart may be forgiven thee.* Not to exhort men to Pray, is not to exhort them to deſire Grace, and true Converſion: Common Grace, and Natural Self-love have their deſires, which are not all in vain; its better to be near the Kingdom of God, than to be diſpiſers of it.

God hath fixed the time of the Lord's day, and the undiſpoſed muſt not ſay, we will not keep it till the Spirit *move* us; As it is a duty to Relieve the Poor, ſo it is to Pray, as ſoon as God commandeth it; and none muſt ſay, I will not Give or Pray till the Spirit move me, but wait for more help of the Spirit in the way of duty.

LXXVII. That, becauſe no man can come to Chriſt too ſoon, therefore no man can too ſoon believe that he is Elect and Juſtified, though he have no evidence to prove it, and though he know not God, or Chriſt, or the Spirit, or the Goſpel.

LXXVIII. That men are bound to Believe that Chriſt Believed for them, and Repented for them, and muſt no more queſtion their Faith and Repentance than they muſt queſtion Chriſt (as *Saltmarſh* ſpeaketh), as if Chriſt had had Sin to repent of, or a Savionr to ſave him from it; and, as if this were no Covenant-Condition required of our ſelves, as neceſſary to our Juſtification. They may next ſay, Chriſt that is Holy for them, ſhall be Saved in ſtead of them.

LXXIX. That

LXXIX. That to Believe, that we are Elect and Justified, is *fides Divina*, a Believing the word of God, because his Spirit's witness of it, by inspiration is his word.

LXXX. That nothing done by an unregenerate man, by common Grace, maketh him any fitter to Believe and be Converted, than if he were without it, because it is sin.

LXXXI. That it is no Grace, which is not unresistible; and because we cannot Merit it, we cannot resist, and forfeit it.

LXXXII. That Pardon and Justification, being perfect, the first *Moment* of our Faith, therefore it is only one momentous Act of Faith only that Justifieth us; and no Act of Faith it self Justifieth us after that hour. This is held by the more moderate sort, who say not, that we are Justified before Faith.

LXXXIII. That we must act *from Life*, but not *for Life*; as if *Natural Life* were not to be used for *Spiritual Life*.

LXXXIV. They hold, That Sin being all (past, present, and future) Pardoned at first, we must not ask Pardon any more, but only the fuller Belief and Sense of Pardon.

LXXXV. They hold, that no Sin, or declining of a Justified Person, should ever make him doubt of his Justification.

LXXXVI. They hold, that the meaning of *Rom.* 8. 28. is, That all the sin that an Elect, or Justified man committeth, shall certainly work for his greater good, when the Text speaketh but of Enemies and Sufferings, and all the Providences of God; As if it were the way of God's Wise and Holy Government, so far to encourage men to sin, as to assure all that love God beforehand,

that the more they sin, the better it shall be for them, whereas he hath filled the Scripture with so many terrible threatnings against Sin and Backsliding. And, as if no Justified person, by sin, did ever gnow worse than before, or love God less, or at all displease him. Or it were for our good to be worse, and love God less, or displease him, or lose any measures of Grace and Glory (in Title).

LXXXVII. They take Justification in the Great day of Judgment, to be none of our proper Justification by Faith, because that was done before; but a *Declaration* of it: As if Justification had but one degree, and the word but one sence; or any were perfecter Justification than that, and a Decisive Sentential Declaration, were not the most eminent.

LXXXVIII. Those that confess works of Obedience to Christ, to be the Condition of Glorification, yet deny it to be a Condition of Justification in Judgment; when as to Justifie us in Judgment, is to Justifie our right to Impunity and Glory, and so the Condition must be the same.

LXXXIX. Though God oft, and plainly saith, That all men shall be judged according to their works, and according to what they have done in the Body, [good or evil]; and to judge, is either by decisive sentence to *Justifie*, or to *Condemn*; or executively to Reward and Glorify, or to Punish; yet many that Confess that men shall be so *Judged*, do deny that they shall be so *Justified*, though Justifying be Judging.

XC. Though the word [*According to their works*] do plainly signify, *The Cause to be then decided*, in order to the sentence of Salvation or Damnation; and Christ *Mat.* 25. and elsewhere, hath

hath largely enumerated the parts of that Cause, and call it Righteousness, and that with a *Causal* particle; and though the Scripture mention our inherent and acted Righteousness, (in terms of the same signification) above Six hundred times; and that as the thing that pleaseth God, and that he loveth, hateing the contrary; telling, us that the unrighteous shall not enter into Heaven, *&c.* Yet do they feign, that all that Godliness which hath the promise of this Life, and That to come, and which God, is said as a Righteous Judge to Reward and Crown, is mentioned only as a *sign* of the *Elect* and *Righteous*, and of Faith, and not as the Cause to be then decided, or as a Rewarded thing. And for whom is this *sign* so solemnly produced? God knoweth us without Signs: His Light in our Consciences will make us know our selves, by Internal Perception. And if it be to confute the Devil and his servants that slander us, it is for want of Righteousness, and not only for want of *signs* of it, that we are accused; and it is more than *signs* that must confute them for our Justification. And the Judgment is not to be managed as at a human judicature, by talking it out with every Person, but by an universally convincing Light, that at once can shew every man in the World his own particular case, as in it self; it is not *Signs*, but *Righteousness*, that hath the promises of Reward: And there is no Righteousness that so far maketh not a man Righteous, and so far Justifiable.

XCI. They (some of them) say, that we shall need no Justification against any false Accusation: For who should accuse us? *Christ* will not, Conscience will not; and Devils, say they, will have something else to do: And they, know that false

accusation will be in vain before such a Judge. The sum of this, is, that there will indeed be no day of Judgment, and no Justification by decisive Sentence; yea, and no Salvation; for actual Glorification will be a Sentence, manifested by Execution (which Mr. *Lawson* thought was called the Judgment.) And if no Judgment, then no Judge, no Reward, no Condemnation, and no Punishment: If any Judgment, there must be Persons, and a Cause to be tryed and judged. 1. The Cause of that day, will not be, whether *Christ* be a sufficient Saviour, or have made sufficient satisfaction? It is not for *Christ* to judge himself: It is not to judge God, whether he elected us? It is not to judge, whether we were of the Seed of *Adam*, or whether we ever sinned? Or whether the Law of Innocency condemn us; And our sin deserve everlasting Punishment? There is no justifying us against any such Accusation: It must be all confess'd we were the sinful Children of *Adam*; we deserved Condemnation. But the Cause will be, 1. Whether we are lyable, by Guilt, to future Punishment? And against this, our Pardon justifyeth us. 2. And, whether we have Right to the Heavenly Inheritance? And in this, the Gospel-Donation, Covenant, or Promise, justifieth us; and both thro' the Merits of the Sacrifice, and Righteousness of *Christ*. 3. And the other part of the Cause of that day, is, whether we have part in *Christ*, and the Merits of his Righteousness? In which our Faith, and God's Covenant will justifie us. 4. And the Question, being, Whether this Faith be that which had the promise, and not a Counterfeit; the description of it, by its Acts and Part, and not only by adventitious Signs, must be our justifying Evidence: The faith that hath

hath the Promise, is essentially *Christianity*, or a Covenant, accepting of God the Father, Son, and Spirit of *Christ*, as our Teacher, Priest, and King, by affiance, expressed in assent, consent, and subjection: And all that is essential to this; yea, the necessary integrality and modification have their parts in being the Cause of the day.

And as to the Case of Accusation; 1. A Virtual Accusation by the Law, which we have broken, and condemneth us, requireth a Justification, if there were no more. 2. The Glory of *Christ*'s Merits, Righteousness and Grace, requireth a Justification of us, against our real Guilt. 3. And is not Satan the Accuser of the Brethren, and that before God? And did not his Malice so work against *Job*, though God contradicted him?

It is certain, that sentential and apologetical Justification relates to Accusation (virtual or actual) and Condemnation. *Who shall condemn us, it is God that justifieth us?* And if we are not justified against false Accusations, we shall never be justified against any.

But we all confess, that we are *made righteous*, efficiently by Grace, and constitutively by Righteousness, in despight of all Satans true accusations, and against all our own unworthiness, ungodliness, (antecedently) and guilt; and that before all Works and Perseverance, save a true accepting Faith in *Christ*: But if we shall in judgment be decisively declared righteous, by that which constituteth us righteous; (of which, no knowing man herein can doubt, God judging all things truly as they are) then certainly will men by decisive declaration, be judged righteous, as being pardoned and adopted by the Merits of *Christ*, and qua-

lified by true Faith, Repentance and Obedience, for that Guift.

XCII. They absurdly hold, that to be justified, as to the sincerity of our Faith, from the charge of Hypocrisie, or unsoundness, it is not the Justification of the *Person*: A contradiction that I am ashamed to be long in confuting. Is it the *Faith* and not the *Person* that is to be judged? Is it not as it is the *Persons Faith?* What is it to justifie his Faith, but to justifie him to be a true *believing Christian*, and so to be an Heir of the Promise: The necessary qualification of Faith (if it be operative) is as truly a part of the condition of the Promises, as that Faith be Faith indeed.

Indeed some sound Divines say, [*That Faith justifieth us as sinners, and Works justifieth our Faith, as accused Believers.*] But they never meant that by justifying our *Faith*, it justifieth not our Persons: But that we are at first, constituted just, and adopted, upon the condition of a consenting covenanting Faith, before we have time to shew it by outward Works; and that we are continued and judged, justified and intitled to Life, on condition of our Performance of the Essentials of our Covenant.

XCIII. They hold, that we are justified by the same Law or Covenant of Innocency, which condemneth us: Because, say they, we have fulfilled it in, and by *Christ*; falsly (as is aforesaid) supposing, that *Christ* was either such a Surety as was in the same Bond, disjunctively with the principal, or else that the principal (man) was allowed to do his Duty, or bear his Suffering by another: And so they deny the Gospel-Covenant, and Gift, which is that indeed, which justifieth us by the way of Redemption, falsly supposing, that the very

very damning Law doth justifie us, by way of Prevention, as innocent, as having fulfilled it in *Christ*.

XCIV. They suppose, that *Christ* will not judge and justifie us, according to any Law, by which he governed us, but only by declaring his absolute Decree and Will; giving no Reason of his Sentence, from the cause or different performance, or non-performance of the Persons judged; and so that Judgment is no act of Moral Government, or of Reward, contrary to all the Scripture.

XCV. They falsly suppose, that *Pardon* of *sin*, is no Justification, constitutive, or sentential. Because, say they, that doth but save us from Punishment; but to be Righteous, is to be by imputation, such as have kept all the Law, and so have never sinned. But we have no such Righteousness as they thus feign; when the Question is, whether we are sinners? We must confess it, and not plead that we have no sin. But when the Question is, whether we are to be condemned, Pardon is our Righteousness; and having the Pardon of all sin original, habitual and actual, of omission and commission, we are *in statu quo prius*; and if that be not enough, to intitle us to Glory, Adoption added to it, is: And so our Right is justified.

XCVI. They say, that to hold, that *Christ*'s Righteousness and Merit, is to make our Faith, and holy Obedience, rewardable, is a *Popish* Doctrine against *Free Grace*: As if *Christ* had not come to save his People from their sins, and to make them holy, and zealous of Love and good Works; or God were grown so indifferent to his Image, and to *Christ* within us, and so forgetful of all his Promises of Reward, that he would accept and reward our Fidelity, and Obedience to *Christ*, never the more for all *Christ*'s meritorious Sacrifice,

fice, Righteousneſs and Interceſſion, which is the only Price that purchaſeth our Acceptance; and as if Judgment ſhould make no difference between mens rewardableneſs, but only judge *Chriſt* to have been a Saviour to the Elect.

XCVII. They deviſe a Plea for the juſtifying of all the wicked damnable Hypocrites in Judgment; while they tell them that there will be no need of a Juſtification againſt the Charge of Hypocriſie and Unholineſs, but only againſt the Charge of being ſinners; and ſo they can ſay, that all were ſinners as well as they; and that *Chriſt* was offered them as a Saviour that had made a ſufficient Sacrifice for their forgiveneſs: And they profeſſed to believe in him, as their Saviour: And as to the ſoundneſs of their Faith, there will be no need of Juſtification. And if *Chriſt* ſay, *I was hungry, and ye fed me not, I was naked, and ye cloathed me not*, &c. They are taught to ſay, The Righteouſneſs of their own perſonal Holyneſs or Obedience, is none of the Cauſe of the day, to juſtifie them, or to be tryed, and juſtified.

XCVIII. Some ſay, that Chriſt Reconciled Man to God, but did not Reconcile God to Man; becauſe God was at no enmity with the Elect, but loved them from Eternity; and to the Reprobate, he is unreconciled. It is true, that Chriſt made no real change on God by his Reconciliation: But by his Sacrifice, and Merits, and Interceſſion, he made it a thing *Juſt* and *Meet* for God to forgive and ſave us, notwithſtanding all our Guilt, all his Holineſs, Juſtice and Truth; and ſo diſſolving our obligations to puniſhment, and removing the impediments of our Reconciliation; he is by extrinſick denomination ſaid to be Reconciled to us, when he is no way bound to Damn

us;

us; and this without any change in God: But the Clouds being thus dispelled, that were between God and us, his Face as Reconciled, shineth on us. God was in Christ Reconciling the World to himself, by making them capable of personal plenary Reconciliation, by purchasing a Free Pardon to be offered to all; tho' they have after need to be intreated to be personally and actually Reconciled to God, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19,20. Gods Love of Benevolence, goeth before his Love of Complacence, tho' the change be really in the Object only.

XCIX. Dr. *Crispe*, and all that say, that our own Obedience and Duties and personal Righteousness do us no good, nor further our Salvation (Christ doing all that) and that it hindereth Salvation to do any thing for Salvation, do plainly make Heavenly Blessedness, and God himself, as sought, loved and enjoyed to be against our Salvation. For all our Sanctity, is but our Love of God, and our Fruition of him: And the perfection of this, is our Heaven and Happiness; and Holiness is here the beginning of it: And if it be against the Grace of Christ, to seek Heaven and the Fruition of God, and to be receptive of it by Holyness, and to seek God, be the way to keep us from him (as not going out of our selves to Christ); How then is Christ the way to the Father? How doth he bring us to God? Why doth he Sanctify us, and bid us seek and strive to enter? Will Heaven be against Heaven, and God against God to us? If so, then striving to be saved from Sin, and Hell, is the way to bring us to Sin and Hell; which none would hold, that knoweth how much of Hell Sin it self is, and how much Holiness is of Heaven.

C. They falsly reproach the *Orthodox* that erre not with them, as *Enemies of Free Grace*, and *as*

not

not going out of themselves, and by odious Words, as *being for Justification by Works*: When it is they themselves that overthrow all Justification, and the Gospel, as Justifying us, and Justification by *Faith* it self, calling it *Credere*, and a Work: Ridiculously, making *Credere* and *Faith*, to signify diverly: And tell us not when it is the *Phrase*, and when it is the the *Meaning*, that they oppose. If it be the Phrase that they oppose, they condemn Christ, and the Scripture; that say, Men are Justified by their *Words* and *Works*. If it be the Sence, let them tell what that Sence is, which they accuse; and not confound the Controversies of the *Name*, and of the *Thing*. Those that they reproach, Renounce all *Works* for Justification or Salvation, that arrogate the least part of the Office, Merits, or Grace of Christ; or that make the Reward not of Grace, but of Debt: Yea, all that Honour not Christ and Grace, more than if he had not required them; and did not, as dwelling in us by his Spirit, cause them, and make them acceptable to God: But we will not renounce Christ living in us, nor the use, and worth of the Image of God.

CHAP. III.

To moderate Mens over-hot Censuring the Erroneous.

Reconcil. HAving enumerated a Century of their Errours, I shall next tell you, how, and why, notwithstanding all these gross Corruptions, you should moderate, and regulate your Censure of the Men, and of other such.

Ortho. *You have told me sufficiently what to think of*

of them, when you have told me what they hold; I must neither judge of the Faith *by the* Man, *nor forbear judging of the* Man *by his* Faith. *Can any man judge too hardly of men that overthrow all Religion? They seem to me to be Atheists, Infidels, Anti-Christians, Prophane, and open Enemies of all that is Holy and Good, save only the Name of God, and Christ, and Free Grace, and that Good which they oppose.*

This Character of them, I gather from your own Words.

I. *They deny the only true God, and feign or make us another God: The true God is Holy, and hateth sin: But they feign a God, who is the maker of sin; yea, that made his own Son the greatest sinner in the World, by making all the sins committed by all the Elect, to be really his sins, and so making him the worst of men.*

II. *Yea, whereas Devils can but tempt men to sin, they feign God to translate our sins themselves Essentially on* Christ, *and so to make him a sinner that could not be tempted to it.*

III. *They make us another* (pretended) Christ, *and so deny the true* Christ, *and so are* Anti-christs. *The true* Christ *had no sin, but only became a Sacrifice for our sin; which were laid upon him, no further than to suffer for us. But they feign a* Christ, *that was a hater of God, an Atheist, a Servant of the Devil, and the greatest sinner in all the World, and yet sinned not himself.*

IV. *They deny God dwelling in us as Love, and* Christ *living in us by his Spirit, by feigning us to be never the better for his Grace and inward Operations, as to any furtherance of our Salvation; as if the Life of* Christ *within us, were not saving.*

V. *They deny the great Ends, and use of a Saviour, to save us from Sin, as a means to save*

us

us from Hell, and as the means of our Glorification; and as a Prophet by his Doctrine and Example, to teach us how to seek and obtain the purchased Salvation.

VI. *They deny the Holy Ghost, by denying that his Sanctifying Work and Grace, must be esteemed and used as a furtherance of our Salvation: Because* Christ *hath saved us by himself already.*

VII. *They deny the Gospel, while they deny it to be the Law or Donation of God, which as an Act of Oblivion, is his Instrument of our Justification and Pardon; our Title to life (for* Titulus est fundamentum juris;*) And as the Instrument of our virtual Justification.*

VIII. *They do as Anti-christians, deny* Christ's *Prophetical Office, by which, by Doctrine and Example, he teacheth us what we must do to be saved; And his Kingly Office, by which he maketh Laws to Rule us, or to Judge us by, as the imposed term of Life and Death.*

IX. *They deny the Law of Innocency, and forge another of their own instead of it, which nameth* Christ *as instead of us.*

X. *They hold all the Elect Lawless, and so no Subjects of* Christ, *while they say, they are under no Law.*

XI. *Hereby they deny God and Christ's Government by Law.*

XII. *They have no humiliation for sin, and say, they have no sin; for since* Christ's *death, it is none of theirs.*

XIII. *They hold, that there is no such thing as sin in the World (of the Elect) because Christ took it from them (before they were born or had it;) and he hath none now in Heaven.*

XIV. *They deny all Justification by Faith, and say, that it is not by* Faith, *but by the Object of Faith only.*

XV. *They*

XV. *They make Christ no true Mediator, but such a surety as was a party in the Bond with us, and suffered for his own sin, and was condemned by that Law of Innocency for us.*

XVI. *They deny Justifying Faith it self, while instead of it they feign a meer belief that we are Justified.*

XVII. *They harden ungodly men in their damning presumption, obtruding on them a belief, that they are Elect and Justified, tho' ungodly; and telling them, that this is coming out of themselves to Christ, and that they cannot believe this too soon; and that Christ hath Repented, Believed, and been Holy for them.*

XVIII. *They directly fight against all mens Salvation, by telling them, that they ought to do no Duty inward or outward, as a means of their Salvation, lest it be against* Christ *and* Free Grace *which saveth them. And that nothing that they do, can do them any good, nor any sin, possibly can do them any hurt, because they are already perfect, and saved only by Christ.*

XIX. *They expose Christianity to the scorn of Infidels, by telling men, that it consisteth in that which every novice in Logick or Reasoning, knoweth to be impossible; that one mans Sins, and one mans Righteousness, should be made anothers: "Not only so far as that others partake of the Effects (Christ of our sins in sufferings, and we of the benefits of his Righteousness) which we all maintain; but that the thing it self, is essentially thus transferred: And so the Accidents do* transire a Subjecto in Subjectum: *And whereas* Sin *and* Righteousness, *are Accidents in the three predicaments of Habit (or Privation) Acts, and Relation, they feign the* Habits, Acts, *and* Relation, *of odious deformity of all the Elect,*

to

meaning of a Word, may deny the Word, and yet hold fast the matter signifyed by it And he that speaketh the greatest Errour in *Terms* not understood, may mean and hold the truth.

2. And Consequences not discerned, will not prove a man to be a real Heretick, or one that holdeth not the truth, which by such consequences he subverteth: Therefore all Pacificators conclude, that Consequences are not to be charged too far, when not understood.

Ortho. *Who knoweth mens minds but by their Words? What ever they be to God who searcheth the heart, they are damnable Hereticks* in foro Ecclesiastico.

Reconcil. I excuse not the *Words* which I have largely accused: I would save others from them, I confess it is *Words* that the Church must judge of, and judge by. But it must be *Words* as significant of the *Matter*, and of the *Mind* of the speaker. And therefore the Church must try the speakers meaning by informing and convincing questions and explications. I pray you tell me, when you are Catechizing your Parishioners (young or old) do you meet none that in ignorance speak words that subvert the Foundation? And yet when you better search their meaning, you may find that they mean better than they speak. I write against all their dangerous words, especially to save others from being drawn by them to errour, and to Prevent the errour that the Church and Gospel may receive thereby.

Ortho. *But if they defend them, they are Hereticks: For how else shall we know whether they deny not Fundamentals?*

Reconcil. I will tell you how; Ask him first, whether he believe the Fundamental Truth? If he say,

say, yea: Ask him whether if he knew that his Consequence contradicted or subverted it, which of the two he would let go? And by that, you may know which it is that he holdeth fastest.

For Instance, Ask such a one as Dr. *Crispe*, whether he would hold that Christ was really a sinner, and God made him such, and the Essence of all our sins were his, and none of ours, if he knew that this were inconsistent with the perfection and Office of Christ, and the truth of the Gospel? Ask him whether he would hold that the sin of the Elect cannot possibly do them any hurt; nor any Duty that they do, be any means or help to their Good or Salvation, if he knew that this were contrary to the Gospel and Free Grace, and tended to mens damnation? Ask him whether he would hold that our inherent and acted Righteousness did not make us so far Righteous, and no whit furthered our Justification or Salvation, if he knew this were a contradiction, and against Christ?

Ortho. *By this Rule, we shall judge none Hereticks, but Infidels; for who will expressly renounce Christianity but they?*

Reconcil. The Word *Hereticks*, is variously used as men are inclined: 1. Of all that are stiff in any hurtful Errour, against sound Doctrine; and so all or most Christians are Hereticks. For all have many Errours, and all men are too stiff in their own conceits. 2. For those that consequentially subvert Essentials.

Amesius is not singular, who saith (in *Cas. Consc.*) that *Theology* is so concatenated, that every Errour by consequence (near or remote) subverteth the Foundation. I would except only Genealogies, Chronologies, Topography, Grammar, & some Prophecies & Positives: But of meer morals it is not improbable.

3. For all that Schismatically separate from the Apostolical Churches and their Communion, and gather Sects to themselves, for the promoting of their Errors; I provoke you to name to me any Text of Scripture, that calleth any by the reproved Name of Hereticks, that did not separate from the Catholick Church? Though all Schismaticks be not Hereticks (for some cause divisions in the Church, and yet depart not from it): Yet all Hereticks in Scripture-sence were Schismaticks; for αἵρεσις signifieth not only the chooſing of a new Doctrine, but also a new separated Sect and Church, for the promoting of it.

Ortho. *These Libertines are generally Separatists.*

Reconcil. You are historically mistaken: Dr. *Crispe* was a Conformist himself; and so have been many hundreds, who have held some of the forementioned mistakes. Have you read *Luther* on the *Galathians*? And *Æpinus*, and *Gallus*, and *Amsdorphius*, and *Schlusselbergius*, and abundance such *Lutherans*, who damn *George Major* for saying, That Good works are necessary to Salvation, and that maintained, that they were hurtful to Salvation (tho' no doubt they meant, that confidence in them was hurtful). Have you read *Islebius*, that turned from *Antinomianism* to be a *Papist* Bishop, and helpt to rectifie *Luther*'s Phrase, by calling him to oppose him? Have you read Learned *Beza* himself, and many, and many such excellent men, both *Calvinists* and *Lutherans*, of imputed Righteousness, and against Imputing Faith for Righteousness, and of the definition of Faith? Till *Camero*, *Placeus*, *Amyraldas*, *Capellus*, *Testardus*, *Codurcus*, *Bloudel*, *Dallæus*, *Drelincourt* stopt them; and before them *Melanchthon*, *Bucer*, and after *Cargius*, *Olevian*, *Ursine*, *Parcus*, *Scultetus*, *Wende-*

Wendeline, *Ludovitus Crocius*, *Conradus Bergius*, *Johannes Bergius*, *Martinius*, and ſuch other great Divines ſtopt them in *Germany*: How many ſpeak indefenſibly? How many Biſhops and Conformiſts in *England*, have held, and written unjuſtifiable words about Juſtification? Was Dr. *Tully* a Non-conformiſt? No, nor Mr. *Roberough*, Mr. *Walker*, and many ſuch, before the Aſſemblies times.

Though Dr. *Gell*, Mr. *Thorndike*, and many ſuch did ill, in inveighing againſt *imputed Righteouſneſs*, in undiſtinguiſhing words; yet too many by a very ill ſence and ſort of it, gave them too much occaſion; which put ſo many Learned, Judicious Divines to explain it, of whom in *England* the chief were *Ant. Wotton*, Mr. *William Bradſham*, Mr. *Tho. Gataker*, Biſhop *Davenant*, Biſhop *Robert Abbot*, Mr. *William Fenner*, and other Zealous Converting Preachers; ſuch as *John Rogers*, *Tho. Hooker*, *Tho. Shephard*, and the *New-England* Churches againſt Mrs. *Hutchinſon*, and Mr *Wheeler*, that by Mr. *Weld* publiſhed the *Narrative of the* Antinomian *Errors*; and of the ſtrange Monſters from Mrs. *Dyer*, and Mrs. *Hutchinſon*, and her death; and of late, Mr. *Benj. Woodbridge*, Mr. *Tho. Hotchkis*, Mr. *Tho. Warren*, Mr. *Graile*, Mr. *Jeſſop*; but eſpecially Mr. *Truman*, Mr. *Gibbons* of *Blackfryers*, and Dr. *Stillingfleet*. It is not a thing unknown, that it was not only ſuch as you call Separatiſts, but many Biſhops and Conformiſts, that in oppoſition to Popery, for want of diſtinguiſhing, have ſuch words about Imputation, as encouraged the *Antinomians*. Therefore you cannot take all as Hereticks in the Scripture-ſence, who hold the ſame Errors.

Ortho. *Then we shall not know what Heresie is, if men do not segregate themselves to propagate it.*

Reconcil. You may know what opinions are pernicious, (or if you will Heretical) when you know not whether the man be a Heretick that owneth them: Even the Heretick Hereticating Papists say, there must be an obstinacy against sufficient light of evidence. And all tenatiousness through prejudice, ignorance, or incapacity is not obstinacy. If your Scholiar or Apprentice be seven years learning what you teach him, it may not by that be proved obstinacy.

The word *Heretick* is used as please the speaker, in various sences. 1. Some call all Hereticks that obstinately oppose any Opinion, (or truth) which the Church determineth to be Believed. 2. Some call all Hereticks that gather any segregate Church to maintain or propagate any Error. 3. Some call all Hereticks, who oppose any Point essentiall to Christianity; though but ignorantly by remote consequence. 4. Some call those Hereticks, who deny some one essential Article of Christianity, directly and knowingly, while they own the rest. 5. And some call none Hereticks but those that joyn together, the denying of some essential Article directly or by plain evident consequence, and gather segregate Churches to propagate it, and do this obstinately against sufficient light: If you will use the *Name*, tell men which of these you mean.

Ortho. *You encourage Heresie, by making it so hard to know a Heretick: May we not know them by their Doctrine?*

Reconcil. You may know what is Error, and Heretical, when you know not the man to be an Heretick: do what you can justly, to save men

men from their Error, without unjust and uncharitable censuring of the persons. To which end I remember you of the writing of worthy Dr. *Fowler, that Holiness is the design of Christianity:* If then it prove that many of these that hold these bad opinions, are men of *sincere Holiness*, then Christianity in them hath reached to its design: Now I find that the most of them that I have known, seem to me to be persons of serious Holiness (notwithstanding their infirmities): They are Zealous towards God; they greatly honour Christ; they avoid known Sin; they live justly and charitably towards men; yea, it is the Piety and Strictness of the lives of many of them, which hath drawn many well-meaning ignorant persons to their Errors. *Bunnian*, an unlearned Antinomian-Anabaptist, wrote against the foresaid Book of Dr. *Fowler*; yet (abating his separation) I never heard that *Bunnian* was not an honest Godly man. If then he attained the design of Christianity, was he not a Christian?

Ortho. *Could he be Godly that said and did so much against the Truth, and so much to draw men to his Errors?*

Reconcil. There is no man without many Errors: And do not all desire that others should take that for Truth, which they take to be Truth? And how few be there in the world, that embody not with some Sect or Faction, for the promoting of their Opinions? And how few that do not over-vilifie and wrong those from whom they differ?

And *Bunnians* last preachings give me hope that he repented of his Errors; for he Zealously preached but the common acknowledged doctrine of Christ's readiness to receive and pardon converted sinners.

Ortho. *But unholy Doctrine will not make men holy, nor consist therewith.*

Reconcil. 1. It is Holy Doctrine, practically received, that maketh them Holy; and that which is Unholy, is received but notionally, and so prevaileth not against the power of truth. No doubt but false unholy Doctrine greatly tendeth to unholiness of heart and life; Therefore let us all do our best to cure it. But it is not the sharpest censures, nor the greatest fierceness, or foulest words, or punishments, that are the right or wisest way of cure: But the clearest explication of the Truth, and the most loving and meek instructing opposers, if God peradventure will give them repentance, to the acknowledging of the Truth.

Ortho. *I am sure General Councils, and Heathens, Bishops and Emperors also of old, were severe against Hereticks.*

Reconcil. What will you say, if I fully prove, that Hereticks themselves, as such, did not *more hurt* to the Church, than the stir and violence used against them that were accounted such, hath done, and still doth? No, nor so much hurt: But what need I more proof of this, than what Popery hath done these 800. or 900. years in the World? Did Hereticks ever murder so many hundred thousands as the Papists did of the *Waldenses, Bohemians, French* Protestants, *Dutch, Irish, English, Polanders, Hungarians*, &c. by Wars, Massacres, Inquisitions, *&c.*

Ortho. *Those men were not Hereticks, but men falsly accused of Heresie: Why instance you in* Papist *Tyrants?*

Reconcil. And who think you will be Judge who shall suffer as Hereticks? Will it not be those that

are

are uppermost, and get greatest strength? And are those usually the wisest: Who is the Judge, now in the *Turks* Dominions? and among Christians? who is Judge in *Muscovy*, where Preaching is forbidden?

Ortho. *But it is the Clergy that is the Judge of Heresie.*

Reconcil. And how small a part of the Earth is so happy as to have the major part of the Clergy, wise, sound, honest and orthodox? Where's the Clergy so powerful as in the *Roman* Kingdom? And where more erroneous, or more cruel?

Ortho. *But you must instance in times of the Churches Purity, and not in the time of Anti Christs Reign.*

Reconcil. Few of us are agreed, when the time of the Church-Purity ended, from the Apostles days; till the Fall of the *Pagan* Empire, there were great Numbers of Hereticks in the Church; and no Sword was drawn, or desired, against them, by the Churches: And yet all the Number of that time, mentioned by *Epiphanius*, hurt not the Church, so much as the Pride and Contention of the Clergy, even before *Diocletians* Persecution, if *Eusebius* may be believed, *lib.* 8. *c.* 1.

And for long time after, the Church abhorred the use of the Sword, or Violence, against Hereticks: Or else *Martin* had not with such abhorrence, separated from the Bishops that were for the use of the Sword, against the *Priscilian* Gnosticks.

And whereas *Austin* is cited as the chief that changed his mind herein, his instance is but one, and it is usually abused. 1. It being not against Heresie, but Schism, that he writeth: The Donatists were Prelatical Zealots, that thought themselves the greater Number, and so called themselves

ſelves the Church; for being the ſuppoſed Majority in *Africk*, and having the trueſt Biſhop, as the Papiſts and ſome Prelatiſts arrogate the Name of the Church on thoſe Accounts: What Errour had they more than *Cyprian*, and all his pious Councils had, ſaving their Factiouſneſs for their own choſen Biſhop.

2. And it was not this Shiſm neither, that *Auſtin*, was for Violence againſt, but to repreſs Force with Force; for the Donatiſts uſed Murder and Violence.

But come to the Times and Councils that ſuppreſſed Hereticks with the greateſt Zeal. I have nothing herein to ſay againſt the Council of *Nice*; though ſome good men think that they had done better to tolerate the *Eaſter-Day* different; yea, and to have done leſs to ſtir up Diſputes about One Subſtance: But do you think *Neſtorius* did more hurt, by ſaying, That *Mary* was not to be called, *The Mother of God*; but, [*The Mother of him who is God*,] than was done by baniſhing him? Who was ſo far from being a Sectary, that he was the greateſt Patriarch, and ſo deadly an Enemy to the tolerating of men, called Hereticks, that he began with urging the Emperour to proſecute them; and was juſtly ſo uſed for his Violence, as a Heretick himſelf: And being baniſhed, ſet up ſo great a Party in *Syria*, and other Countries, to this day, called *Neſtorians*, as continue the abhorrence of the Council of *Calcedon* and *Epheſus*, and the Church of *Rome*, and the great Diviſions of the Chriſtian Church, Would the tolerating of the accuſed Phraſe have done ſo much Hurt as this?

And did the Biſhops and Councils, that condemned his Adverſaries, *Eutiches* and *Dioſcorus*, and

and banished him that was the second Patriarch of the *East*, do less hurt to the Church, than it would have done, to have patiently instructed them in what sence Christ's Nature remained *Two*, and to have granted, that in other sence and respect, they might be called *One*, as agreeing and united? When now the *Eutychian Jacobites*, by *Dioscorus* Banishment, fill the vast Country of *Abassia*, and many other Countries, in Divisions from other Churches, and Opposition to the Council of *Calcedon*.

And did the *Monothelites* do so much harm, by saying, that Christ might be said to have but *One Will and Operation*, (by Concord, called *One*) as all the Councils and Bishops did, by their condemning and prosecuting them, till the *Imperial* Churches were by it broken all to pieces?

And did the three Words in the Writings of *Theodoret*, *Ibas* and *Theodore Mopsuest*, do so much hurt, as the Councils that condemned these *Tria Capitula* did, by woful Divisions?

Or did they, that *Justinian* called *Corrupticolæ*, do more hurt, than he did, by murdering thousands, and wasting *Ægypt*, and other Countries, by his blind Zeal against Hereticks? Surely there is no Comparison in the hurt.

Epiphanius himself recordeth how much hurt Hereticating Heat did, against *Audius* and others called Hereticks: And *Lucifer Calaritanus* was made a Heretick, for his inordinate Zeal against the *Arrians* themselves. And I think few now doubt, but the blind Zeal of *Epiphanius* himself, and of *Cyril Alexand*; and the Council that condemned *Chrysostom*, as if he were not hot enough against *Origin*, did a great deal more harm than good: And that *Atticus* and *Proclus*, by their Indulgence to the *Joanites*,

anites, were fain to heal the Wounds that those mens Heats had made. And more than *Socrates* and *Zozomene* tell us, that the said *Atticus* and *Proclus* did the Church more Service, against the *Novatians*, by Gentleness and Liberty, than their Predecessors ever did by their zealous Fierceness.

The Church hath suffered much by Sects and Heresie, but, I think, much more by the ignorant Tyrannical Attempts of suppressing them, and of such as are falsly accused of them.

Ortho. *But the Errours of former Times must not stop our Zeal against Errour, nor reconcile us to Heresie.*

Reconcil. But why do we not enquire how far, even the godly Orthodox-Ministers, in these times, also have been guilty of occasioning that which they justly reprehend?

I have seldom observed any Heresie or Errour to rise up, but what the Orthodox were a culpable Cause of: The Chief Rise of *Anabaptisty* hath been by our most vile Abuse of Infant-Baptism, 1. Receiving all Infants of *Atheists* and *Infidels*. 2. And that, on an unproved Title, and on the perfidious Vows and Sponsions of God-fathers and God-mothers, that never owned them, nor intended to perform their Vows. 3. And forceing Ministers to baptise them against their Judgments. 4. And worst of all, instead of causing them at age, solemnly to renew their Christian Covenants, cheating thousands of ignorant Souls, with a Ceremony, called, Confirmation.

So have the *Separatists* risen from the Corruptions of the Clergy and Church, and their wicked Lives, and Tyrannical Impositions and Persecutions.

And so have these *Antinomians* risen, first, From the

the *Papists* False Doctrines, about their Good Works; and next, From many godly *Protestants*, seldom, and unskilful opening the Mystery of Redemption and Grace, and preaching almost all for Humiliation, and too little of the wonderful Love of God, revealed in *Jesus Christ*; till Dr. *Sibbes* and such others, led them into another strein: And, thirdly, by their unskilful Managing the Doctrine and Controversies of Justification; till the *Breme* and *French* Divines abroad, and *Davenant*, *Ant. Wotton*, *Bradshaw*, *Gataker*, and such others at home, taught them to speak more distinctly and solidly, (which *Le Blanck* hath done above all before him.)

And they, that by Unskilfulness have occasioned other mens Extreams, should not be over-rigorous against them.

Enquire into the Temper and Lives of most of this sort of men, among us of late, [even Dr. *Crispe*, *Lancaster* Town, *Walter Cradok*, *Saltmarsh*, *Den*, *Hobson*, and such other] and you will find, that though they had their Temerities and Blemishes, they were in the main, Men, far from wicked and prophane Lives; much more, Mr. *Walker*, Mr. *Roborough*, Mr. *Craudon*, Mr. *Eyr*, blind Mr. *Troughlar*, Dr. *Tully*, and such other that came too near them.

I will now instance more largely, in one, who, in the Fervour of his Zeal, Preach'd at *Pinners-Hall*-Lecture, and after printed a zealous ignorant Sermon, against such of us, as judge not as confusedly and erroneously as himself; when I had avoided Preaching on any such Subject, and Printing what I had long before written on it, lest I should revive the Strife; and yet he is known to be a worthy vertuous Man.

I will

I will give you yet another Proof, that such may be serious godly Men, who Preach a Doctrine, *quoad Verba*, Heretical or Anti-evangelical. The Renovation of an unsanctified Soul, requireth a Change so great, on all our Faculties, as must turn a meer natural man into a spiritual; and give a man a new End, new Principles, and a new Heart and Life; and this by Divine transforming Influence: But to cure one of these Erroneous Men, there needs not so a great Renovation, but only the better informing of an ignorant mans Judgment, that was carryed away by Education, Prejudice, the Veneration of his chief Teachers, and the weakness of his own dull undistinguishing Mind; yea, perhaps, the Cure of his Ignorance, in Grammar or Logick, in some one word, may make him Orthodox.

Could you but get out Prejudice and Ignorance, so far, as to teach these men but Two or Three Distinctions, in all likelihood, it would cure them, *E. G.*

1. To distinguish between a Surety antecedent, and subsequent.

2. To distinguish between the Righteousness of *Christ*, given or imputed to us *in se* it self, (one mans Accidents made anothers) and his Righteousness given us in its Effects and Benefits, reputed the sole meritorious Cause.

3. Between Justification by Efficiency, (principal and instrumental) and justifying us constitutively, (as Matter and Form) justifying by Grant in Law, or by Evidence, or by Witness, or by an Advocate Defence, or by Judicial decisive Sentence, or executely; and these, as supposing actual or legal Accusations.

4. Between the Law or Covenant of Innocency

cy with *Adam*; the Mediatorial Law or Covenant to Christ; the Common Law of Grace, made with *Adam* and *Noah*; the Covenant of Preculianity with *Abraham*; the Political Law of *Moses* to the Jews; and the Law or Covenant of Christ, of Grace, of Faith, by which Christ doth Govern, and will Judge his visible Church. Get unstudied dull heads, but to understand these four distinctions, and you cure them without a new regeneration: And doth not this prove that they are Godly?

To instance no more, but in the first; an Antecedent Surety is either, 1. A party in the Bond; 2. Or an Instrument of the party Bound.

1. If two persons be bound disjunctively (this or that) to a Duty or a Penalty, the bond is answered if either of them perform it. If the Law to *Adam* had either said, thou, or Christ for thee shalt perfectly Obey, shalt dress the Garden, shalt take *Eve* for thy Wife; or that thou or Christ shall suffer for not doing it; then Christ's performance had antecedently freed us from Guilt and Punishment.

2. Or if the Law had said or meant, thou shalt Obey or Suffer by thy self, or by thy substitute or *per alium* as a man may pay his debt by his Servant, or appear by his Attourney; then Christ's Righteousness or Suffering would have proved us guiltless.

But a *subsequent* Surety, who, after the guilt, doth voluntarily, as a Mediator, undertake the discharge of the guilty, is no strict or absolute Representative, but, as a Mediator, purchaseth the Captive, to receive his Grace on the terms, and to the ends, which by a Law or Covenant of Grace, the Mediator shall appoint.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

My Reasons against a tedious needless Confutation.

Sect. 1. THE chief thing that I intended next to be done, that is, To Confute the Hundred Errors before named; I am, on further thoughts, discouraged from performing: 1. Because, upon perusal, I find that I have already done it so oft and largly in many Books unanswered, that repetition is like to be disgracefully nauseous: 2. And they that will neither answer nor read what I have written 34 years ago, or 20, are not like to read what I shall write now.

In my *Confession of Faith*, Printed 1655. I have so largely opened this Controversy, about Justification, Faith, and Works, in necessary distinctions, and many score self-evident Propositions, and many score Arguments, and abundance of expres Texts of Scripture, and above an hundred Testimonies of Protestant Churches Confessions, and eminent Divines, that I find very little needful to be added: And why should I think they will read more that will not read that?

In my Apologies, I have Answered them that have opposed, and have had no reply.

In my Treatise of *Justification*, I have done it over again.

In my *Catholick Theology*, I have thrice overdone the same by Explication and Confutation distinctly.

In my Treatise of *Justifying Righteousness*, in a Disputation, and an Answer to Dr. *Tully*, and to Mr. *Cartwright*, I have done the same, perhaps too largly.

In

In my *Methodus Theologiæ*, I have opened the Caſe methodically and briefly.

In my *Life of Faith*, I have clearly explained it: And muſt I expect no Anſwer, and yet do all again?

2. But my great diſſwaſive is, that it will ſwell the Book to ſo great a magnitude, that few will read it; ſhould I cite all, or moſt of the plain Texts of Scripture that confute them, how great a part of the Bible muſt I Tranſcribe? Yet do they lay Salvation on points that no one Text of Scripture mentioneth.

Sect. 2. 1. If I ſhould cite all the Texts that prove that we are truly Sinners, though Chriſt hath been a Sacrifice for our ſin, and that the guilt of *Fact* and *Fault*, on us, is not taken off by Chriſt's taking the penalty; but we are verily ſinners ſtill; How great a part of the Bible may I recite to prove it?

Sect. 3. 2. If I muſt prove that Chriſt is and was no ſinner, by true imputation of our ſin, as to the guilt of *Fact* or *Fault*, but only as a Sacrifice bear the Penalty; it would be a reproach to the Adverſaries, to need a Confutation of their Blaſphemy, and all the Goſpel would confute them.

Sect. 4. 3. Should I cite all the Texts that prove us to need, and have an Inherent and Acted Righteouſneſs by Grace, beſides Chriſts Perſonal Righteouſneſs Meriting for us, above ſix hundred Texts of Scripture expreſly prove it; and how tedious and needleſs a work is this?

Sect. 5. 4. Should I prove that All Righteouſneſs, ſo far maketh Righteous; and that *making Righteous*, is a Juſtifying, which goeth before *Judging* us Righteous; and that it is a putid con-

tradiction, to say, that any Righteousness doth not *make Righteous, in tantum*, School-boys would turn it into a derision of the opposers.

Sect. 6. 5. Should I prove by Argument, that no Accident can by ye same numerically in divers Subjects, nor *transire a Subjecto in Subjectum*; and so the Habit, Act, and Relation of Righteousness in Christ's Person, cannot in it self be our Habit, Act, or Relation, unless our Persons, and Christ's, be really the same; every novice in Logick, would be too much occasioned to insult over the ignorant gain-sayer.

Sect. 7. 6. Should I prove, that to Justify Efficiently by making Righteous, and to Justify Constitutively (being our Righteousness) and to Justify by Plea, or by Witness, or by Evidence, and to Justify in Estimation or Account, and to Justify by decisive Sentence of a Judge, and to Justify Executively, and to Justify privately in Conscience, and to Justify publickly before Rulers or the World, or more publickly, at the Bar of God, are several senses, of the Word *Justification*, and several sorts; what man of sense would not pity the Confounder that denyeth it, and talk, as if the Word had but one sence?

Sect. 8. 7. Should I prove that by *Imputing*, Paul meaneth truly *accounting a man Just that is so*; reckoning that to him which he hath, and not feigning him to have what he hath not; even Dr. *Crispe* hath spared me that labour, venturing to say, that the contrary sence of *Imputing*, maketh God a Lyar, or deceived. God never judged a man Righteous, that was not first made so.

Sect. 9. 8. Should I prove, that by *Works*, Paul meaneth those that make not the Reward of Grace, but of Debt; and *James* meaneth those that are the effects of *Free Grace*, and purely subordinate

to

to Christ, as commanded by him; the expres Texts do make it needless.

Sect. 10. 9. Should I prove, that Christ is our King, and Ruleth and Judgeth by his own Law, and hath not made us Lawless, and all Judgment or Rule is now committed to him, and that the very Law of Nature, is now his Law; and also the Law of Supernatural Revelation, called by *Paul*, the *Law of Christ*, the *Law of Faith* and of *Grace*; and by *James*, the *Law of Liberty*; the whole scope of the Gospel, saveth me that labour.

Sect. 11. 10. Should I prove, that Christ in *esse objectivo*, as the Object of Faith, is the very specifying form of that Faith it self; and so, that to be Justified by the *Object* as such, and not by that Faith it self, is a notorious putid Contradiction; or should I stand to prove that *Faith* it self, is said by *Paul*, to be Imputed for Righteousness in meer subordination to the meritorious Sacrifice and Righteousness of Christ, and in conjunction with Free Pardon and Adoption purchased by Christ; how needless a work is this made by the Text?

Sect. 12. 11. Should I stand to prove, that Elect Infidels, Atheists, or wicked Men are not Justified, while such (save as God maketh them Just by Conversion & Pardon) all the Scripture tell us, it is needless, and that Eternal Electing to Justification, is not Justifying; nor yet Christs dying for us, till He be *given to us*, as well as *for us*.

Sect. 13. 12. Should I stand to prove, that men shall be judged according to their Works, and that God is the Rewarder of them that diligently seek him; and that Christ hath frequently promised Rewards, and that the same Salvation, which, as to *Value*, is no *Debt*, but meerly a Free Gift of Grace through Christ, is yet, *as to the Order of Conveyance*,

given on *Condition* as a *Reward*, that *Fatherly Love* may attain its ends by *Sapiential* means, and not only by *Power*; *Morally, producing Moral Effects*, in conjunction with *Love* and *Power*; and thus, that the pardoning and saving Acts of the Covenant, impose *Conditions*, as receptive qualifications, which yet are all the Effects of Grace, the whole Scripture maketh this a needless task.

Sect. 14. 13. Should I prove the distinctness; 1. Of the Law and Covenant of Innocency. 2. And of the Law and Covenant of Mediation. And, 3. Of the Mediators Law and Covenant of Grace imposed on us, and sealed in Sacraments; And that the same is both a Law and Covenant, and that the Covenant of Grace, is the Instrumental Gift of Pardon and Justification; How much of the Bible must I transcribe?

Sect. 15. The like I may say, of most of the rest, which I doubt, I have been too large in proving in all the six, or seven, or eight Books before named. I thought also, to have distinctly answered the Printed *Pinners-Hall* Lecture, but he that cannot find it more than fully answered, in the foresaid Books, either never read them, or Answers to such a man, will be vain.

And I am sorry, that the same hand in another Lecture, elsewhere publisheth, that [" *That any are* " *brought to believe in Jesus, is as great a Miracle, as* " *the Resurrection of Christ from the dead*] p. 223. " And after [*There is not a greater Instance of* " *the Power of God in the whole World, than this, in* " *bringing over the heart of a sinner to believe in* " Christ.]

It grieveth my Soul to think what Scandals are thus given by good Men to Papists, *Infidels* and *prejudiced Scorners*, and what work they will make with

with it. No doubt but Faith is a great and difficult Work, and wrought by Almighty Power: For God hath no other Power, but Omnipotency: *omnis Dei Potentia est Omnipotentia, quia Infinita.* Gods Power is his Essence: But the *Instances* and *Demonstrations* of it, are as various as the Effects. Your Finger or Tongue, moveth not, but by Omnipotency: But every Motion or Fly, is not as great an Instance or Demonstration of Power, as Faith is. Nor *Faith* so great an Instance as the making of Angels, Men, Heaven and Earth, Sun, Moon, and Stars, their Natures, Motion and Order: Divines have hitherto taught, that Power is eminently manifested in Creation and Natural Preservation, tho' with *Wisdom* and *Love*; and *Wisdom Eminently* manifested in Government, and *Love* in Glorifying (tho' they were conjunct in each) Man cannot work Miracles, and that so great. And I do not believe that God damneth all unbelievers, as for want of an Act as great as the motion of the Sun, or making the World.

And if it be a Miracle, and as great a one as Christ's Resurrection, How can any believer doubt at all? Why was Christ's Resurrection Preached by the Apostles, so much as the Proof of the Truth of Christianity, and not the Faith of every believer? Then we need not go far to prove the Christian Verity: Every poor Boy or Woman that believeth, hath the fullest Proof, and as great and miraculous as Christ's Resurrection. Why send we not Infidels and Doubters to this Miracle, which is about them in all ages in thousands; Over-doing is undoing.

And yet no doubt, the Author saith truly, that *Faith in Christ is so hard a Work*, that he that *never found it hard, hath none* (or hath it but in the seed,

and yet unrooted, or untryed. But alas! Infidels find it too hard to them.

To conclude, Instead of the larger part of the Proof or Confutations which I intended; 1. I shall with this, Annex a brief Treatise, resolving a multitude of Controversies about Justification, which I have laid by, about Fifteen Years.

2. I refer you to the foresaid former performance of it.

3. Were I not disabled by Pain, and the approaches of Death, I would be ready to Answer any sober, rational Objector.

A Post-script.

Sect. 1. WHereas divers say, they were drawn in to prefix their Names to this Drs. Book, because they were told, that the Errours were expunged: Upon perusal, I find that it is no such matter; but in *Vol.* 3. *Ser.* 3, 4. *&c.* the Author rather more frequently inculcateth the worst of them, *viz.* [*That sin cannot hurt any that are Elect, or that Christ dyed for.*] And that [*in* 1. Joh. *It is a powerful means to keep them from sinning, to believe that if they sin, it can do them no hurt.*]

Sect. 2. The Text drew him to use the *Name* of *sinning*. [*I write to you, that you sin not.*] But did not the Contradiction of it to his Doctrine convince him, while he read the Text against sinning; judge whether he took not the thing to be impossible? He saith, Tho' such do Murder, commit Adultery, Blasphemy, Idolatry, or any such thing, they are no Murderers, Adulterers, *&c.* or Sinners; because it is Christ's sin, and not theirs, and cannot be his and theirs too; so that they may live in the Act, but cannot sin.

Object. *But it was their sin once, before it was Christs sin?*

Answ. No; He saith, that it was Christ's sin, if not from Eternity, at least above Sixteen Hundred Years before we were born. And he that had

no being, could have no sin: And Gods foreknowledge of future sin, maketh not sin: Nay, he could not foreknow, that which would never be; so that indeed, Christ could not take our sin as his, which was not ours, nor ever would be at all: And if he had, yet I hope they will not say, that now in Heaven he is the greatest sinner. And so, there neither was, nor is, any sin in us or Christ.

Sect. 3. But as he repeateth this Errour, I will repeat my Lamentations and Warning to this tempted *Sect.* Hear it as *Speculatoris Tubam*, the Watch-mans Trumpet, that would deliver, if it may be, more than his own Soul.

1. Is it possible, that that which is evil, and the greatest evil it self, can be *in us*, and done *by us*, and do us no hurt?

2. Can that do no hurt to the Elect, that maketh such calamitous Confusions in the World? What, that which filleth the Earth with the darkness of Ignorance, Idolatry, Infidelity, bloody Wars, Persecutions, Torments, Flames, Famine, Malignity, and yet do no hurt to any that are Elect, no, not while they are such themselves?

3. Did *Paul* call himself mad against the Saints, unworthy to be called an Apostle, a wretched man, for that which did him no hurt?

4. Did *David* write all the lamenting Words of *Psal.* 51. and many others; and *Asaph*, Psal. 77, *&c.* for that which did them no hurt?

5. Did God pronounce all the Curses, *Lev.* 26. and *Deut.* 27. *&c.* against that sin that will not hurt the Elect that then lived?

6. Are the recitals of the *Jews* sins and punishments, *Psal.* 78. and 105, 106. *&c.* of things that cannot hurt the Elect?

7. Did

7. Did God send the *Jews* into Captivity to *Babylon* for sins that do the Elect no hurt; even for penitent *Manasses*'s sins?

8. Are all God's threatnings in the whole Scripture, even such as Christ's Words, *Joh.* 15. *Heb.* 6. *Heb.* 10. and *Rev.* 2, and 3. against things that are so harmless? Must we serve God acceptably with Reverence and Godly Fear, because he is a consuming Fire; and because it is a fearful thing to fall into the Hands of the living God, if no sin can possibly do us any hurt?

9. Doth not this opinion contradict every Article of the Creed, every Petition in the Lords Prayer, and every one of the Ten Commandements?

10. If it be no hurt to be tormented with possessions of the Devil, to be Lunatick, Blind, Lame, Dumb, Torn, *&c.* Why is Christ so Praised for healing such, and why appealeth he to his Works against unbelievers?

11. If it be no hurt to be mad, what is *Bedlam* good for? Or to be tormented with *Stone*, *Collick*, *Convulsion*, or any Disease; why will these Phanaticks seek to Physicians, use Medicines, and groan in Pain? *Possidonius* would confute his Tongue by a sower-face or a groan; when he said, *O Pain, thou shalt not make me confess that thou art* (*malum*) ill, or bad.

12. Why do we not take up with the three first Petitions in the Lords Prayer, if our own Interest be not next to be regarded and prayed for?

13. Why pray we for our daily Bread, if there be no hurt to want it; or for the pardon of sin, if punishment be impossible, or hurt not; or against temptations and the evil one, and evil things, if they be no such?

14. Should

14. Should none pray but Reprobates, if others have no hurt to deprecate?

15. Why should we compassionate the poor, or sick, if sin do no hurt to them?

16. Why do men Plow and Sow, and Labour, and Eat, if Famine hurt not, and Labour do no good, because Christ hath done all?

17. Why do Ministers Preach so much against sin, if it can do no hurt?

18. What is it that we are to repent of, if sin do no hurt?

19. Why must fasting, and watchfulness, and resisting temptations be used against Lust, and other sin, if it can do no hurt?

20. What is Baptism, the Lords Supper, Confession, and Absolution then for?

21. Why then should we exhort each other daily, lest any be hardened by this deceitfulness of sin?

22. Why is he called Least, in the Kingdom of God, who breaketh the least Commandement, and teacheth men so?

23. Why is the Education of Children so great a Duty, and he that spareth the Rod, hateth his Child, if sin will do them no hurt?

24. What is God's Governing Justice good for, in punishing sin, if it hurt not?

25. Why must Rulers be Just, and a Terrour to them that do evil, if sin do no hurt?

26. How can that hurt any other Elect Person, that hurteth not the sinner himself?

27. Why is it worse to be cast into the Sea with a Mill-stone, for scandalizing the least, if that scandal cannot hurt them?

28. Why do Libertines labour to escape Prisons, Banishments, Fines, or Hanging for sin, if it can do them no hurt? 29. Why

29. Why is man's nature afraid of Devils, and the Serpents seed, if they cannot hurt us?

30. Why hurt we others by Self-defence, and War, if nothing can hurt us?

31. Why hath God put *Fear* into our Nature, if nothing can hurt us?

32. Was it no hurt to the Elect to be long the Devil's Servants, and to have our Conversion so long delayed, as with many it is?

33. Is sin worse than suffering, if it can do no hurt?

34. Is it no hurt to live and dye in terrible fear of Gods displeasure, and in doubts of our everlasting state?

35. Is it no hurt to have Faith, Love, Desire, and Joy, weak, and to have still the remnants of unbelief, and other such like sins?

36. Is it no hurt to lose some degrees of Love and Holiness, which we have had?

37. Is it no hurt accordingly to have the less of Glory in Heaven?

38. Why are these men for Separation and Church-Discipline, if sin do no hurt?

39. Why pray they for Reformation, and Church-prosperity, and the Thousand Years Glorious State, if sin be so harmless a thing?

40. If all that Christ Merited, be really the Elects, immediately on his purchase, are not all the Elect in Heaven already; yea, before they had any being; whence then is all the gross Ignorance and Errour, and blind Defence of Satans falsehoods, under the Name of Christ and Truth? Why censure they Conformists and others that differ from them? If all that Christ hath, be already ours, and we are as perfect as he, what can Duty, or more Grace, or Heaven, add

to

to us? And why would they have men read their Books, to do no good, and avoid no evil? Is it to make up any imperfection in the Obedience or Righteousness of Christ?

41. Did Christ redeem us from under his own Government, and the Law of Grace? Are we not under the Law [of Christ and Faith, and Liberty] to Christ? Or is there any transgression, if no Law? Or is it Law that we shall not be Ruled and Judged by?

42. Is it no greater Mercy and Grace, to make us like our Saviour in Holiness, and Gods Image, and the Divine Nature, than not? Are Christ's Graces his dishonour?

43. Is it not a vile abuse of his Grace, to contemn it, because it is our own? And to take *Righteousness* to stand against *Free Grace*, if it be but our own? And to pervert *Pauls* Words, that *accounted as dung his own Righteousness*, which he sets in competition or opposition to Christ, calling it that Righteousness which was of (*Moses*) Law; when at the same Word, he sets against it a Righteousness also made his own, which is by the Faith of Christ. Could Christs Righteousness Justify us, if it were not in some kind of Causality (meritorious, material, or formal) made our own: Can an Accident of another Subject be an Accident of us? And will not distinct personality continue to Men, as well as to Angels for ever? We abhor the thoughts of any Righteousness that is of our own possessing or working, otherwise than as given and wrought in us, by the Merits of Christ, and the Free Gift of undeserved Grace; or any that must not by the same Divine Power and Grace be continued. And all that pretendeth to the least part of the Office or Performance

formance of Christ; but only what he freely giveth, and which advanceth the Honour of his Merits and Love, and tendeth to Please and Glorify God, and attain the designed End of Redemption and Salvation.

AS to the Twelve Names that are prefixed to the Book, I leave it to themselves, to speak their own Cause: Only I can say, that one of them taketh the Words, if mean't, as they are written (and indeed inculcated) to overthrow Christianity, and Humanity. And I doubt not, but some of the rest are of the same mind, and had not read the Book, or the Preface, so as to know what was in them.

FINIS.

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. 1. *Prefatory.* page 1.

Chap. 2. *An hundred of their Errors described.* p. 6.

Chap. 3. *To moderate the over-hot Censurers of their Persons.* p. 38.

Chap. 4. *Reasons for present forbearing a tedious Confutation of them, as being fully and often done by me already, and as further, needless.* p. 58.

Post-script. p. 65.

Three BOOKS Lately Publiſhed by Mr. BAXTER, and Printed for *Tho. Parkhurſt.*

1. ENgliſh Non-Conformity, *as under King* CHARLES *the* Second; *Truly Stated and Argued.*

2. Knowledge *and* Love.

3. Cain *and* Abel.

THE *Vanity of Continuing Ceremonies in the Worſhip of GOD; by a Miniſter of the Church of* England.

An Healing Attempt; Conſcience Satisfied, in Submitting Obedience to King WILLIAM *and Queen* MARY.